

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Vol. XII.

No. 4

**Chairman, Editorial Board: HIS GRACE THE
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.**

Editor: Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

**Assistant Editor: The Very Rev. J. M. T.
BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.**

OCT.

1936

**THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE: 1536—1936. By the Rev. PHILIP
HUGHES, L.Sc.Hist.**

CATHOLIC ACTION AND THE WORKER. By E. M. WALL.

**THE ENGLISH MARTYRS AND ENGLISH CRIMINAL LAW. By the
Rev. H. W. R. LILLIE, S.J., M.A.**

For other Features and Full Contents, see page iv.

THE UNIVERSE

184, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

HER RECREATION
PUBLISHED BY THE
PUBLISHERS TAKE

BURNS OATES

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

**PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS
GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE**

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,
and Belles Lettres*

**THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR
CHURCH FURNITURE
CARVED WOOD-WORK
BRASS & SILVER WARE
STATUES & PICTURES**

**DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION**

Catalogues, post free, to any address

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor :
THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor :
THE VERY REV. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.Ser.

VOLUME XII, No. 4.

OCTOBER, 1936.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)
184, Strand, London, W.C.2

THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ
CATHOLIC PAPER

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

The clergy will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

The clergy will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

¶ Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

184, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

- THE FOUNDRESS OF THE SISTERS OF THE ASSUMPTION, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 154 pp. 5s.)
- THE JOY OF SORROW, by David McAstocker, S.J. (The Bruce Publishing Co., Ltd. London: G. E. J. Coldwell. 178 pp. 6s. 6d.)
- REASON AND RELIGION, by J. P. Arendzen, D.D., D.Ph. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 206 pp. 5s.)
- WHEREFORE THIS WASTE? by Father James, O.M.Cap., D.Litt. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 196 pp. 6s.)
- TEACHING THE CATECHISM, by Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. Part I, The Creed. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 50 pp. 1s. 6d.)
- THE TESTAMENT OF MAN, by Arthur Stanley. (London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd. 662 pp. 7s. 6d.)
- KANT'S METAPHYSIC OF EXPERIENCE, by H. J. Paton, M.A., D.Litt. Vols. I and II. (London: George Allen & Unwin. 585 pp. and 510 pp. 30s. the set.)
- EUTHANASIA and other Aspects of Life and Death, by Dr. Harry Roberts. (London, Constable & Co., Ltd. 278 pp. 7s. 6d.)
- THE PROMOTER OF JUSTICE, by Rev. John Carroll Glynn, J.C.L. (Washington: Catholic University of America. 337 pp.)
- CANONICAL LIMITATIONS ON THE ALIENATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY, by Rev. Joseph F. Cleary, J.C.L. (Washington: Catholic University of America. 141 pp.)
- LE CONCEPT DE DROIT SELON ARISTOTE ET S. THOMAS, by R. P. Louis Lachance, O.P. (Paris: Librairie de Recueil Sirey. 442 pp.)
- CHARACTERS OF THE REFORMATION, by Hilaire Belloc. (London: Sheed & Ward. 341 pp. 10s. 6d.)
- CAUSATION FREEDOM AND DETERMINISM, by Mortimer Taube, Ph.D. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 262 pp. 10s.)
- THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND, by W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 542 pp. 21s.)
- THE EARLY BUDDHIST THEORY OF MAN PERFECTED, by I. B. Horner, M.A. (London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 328 pp. 12s. 6d.)
- THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, by V. Burch, D.D. (London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 148 pp. 5s.)
- ADAM SCHALL, by Joseph Duhr, S.J. (Bruxelles: L'Edition Universelle, S.A. 184 pp. 25 frs.)
- PASSIONIS DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI PRAELECTIONES HISTORICAE. Vol. I: A Cena Bethanica ad Iesu Christi comprehensionem. (270 pp. 12 lit.) Vol. II: A Iesu comprehensione as eius traditionem gentibus. (328 pp. 12 lit.) Vol. III: A Iesu gentibus traditione ad eiusdem in cruce supplicium. (520 pp. 15 lit.) (Turin: Marietti.)
- ENGLISH CARMELITES IN PENAL TIMES, by Sister Anne Hardman, S.N.D. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 216 pp. 15s.)

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1936

ARTICLES :—

	PAGE
1. The Pilgrimage of Grace : 1536-1936, By the Rev. PHILIP HUGHES, L.Sc. Hist.	261
2. Catholic Action and the Worker, By E. M. WALL	280
3. The English Martyrs and English Criminal Law, By the Rev. H. W. R. LILLIE, S.J., M.A.	294

HOMILETICS,

By DOM ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.	310
------------------------------------	-----

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—

I. Dogmatic Theology, By the Very Rev. CANON G. D. SMITH, DD., Ph.D.	324
II. Philosophy, By the Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.	327
III. Modern Catholic Literature, By the Rev. S. J. GOSLING	331

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :—

(1) Episcopal Ring,	338
By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	
(2) Personal Expenditure of Religious	339
By the Rev. J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B.	
(3) Juveniles and Censures	340
(4) Viaticum Before Operations	341
(5) Viaticum Repeated the Same Day	342
(6) Position of the Tabernacle	343
(7) Petitions on the Altar	344
By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	

BOOK REVIEWS	344
------------------------	-----

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD	346
-------------------------------	-----

CORRESPONDENCE	348
--------------------------	-----

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE PILGRIMAGE OF GRACE: 1536—1936

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, L.Sc.Hist.

FOR a long time now to come every year is likely to enjoy a certain importance as the quarter-centenary of some event in the progress of the English Reformation. Of all the events that thus invite commemoration, changes in doctrine, revolution in Church discipline, the high moments of the great pillage, statutes, martyrdoms and the rest, none deserves it more than the Pilgrimage of Grace.

No one who has studied, or even read, the standard work¹ on the subject would be likely, in writing about the Pilgrimage, to risk the particular foolishness that comes of the desire to make general statements, for the subject is one of great complexity. Its actors, on the side of the rising, were some of them akin to the martyrs of the time and may one day be recognized officially for such. Others were peasants goaded into movement by social oppression and others still were little better than thieves and freebooters. The demands to promote which they rose, were, of course, as varied in kind as the insurgents themselves, or as the countrysides, from the Wash to the Solway Firth, which were the scenes of the trouble. In this paper I propose to do no more than sketch the time-table of the whole affair, and to say something of the aims of that section of the vast movement to which the title Pilgrimage of Grace properly belongs.

By the October of 1536—the date when the Pilgrimage began—Henry VIII's scheme to set up a new religion had been nearly six years under way, if we count as its beginning his success in extorting from the bishops an acknowledgment of the royal supremacy in February, 1531. As statute followed statute the chain of detailed administrative routine that bound the English Catholics

¹ *The Pilgrimage of Grace 1536-1537 and the Exeter Conspiracy 1538*, by Madeleine Hope Dodds and Ruth Dodds. Two vols. Cambridge University Press, 1915.

to the Holy See was destroyed. Oaths of adherence to the new doctrine were enacted, there was a wholesale acceptance of them on the part of the clergy, a few refusals, and then, in London, the first martyrs. Simultaneously there began a slow flirtation with the current heresies. It bore fruit in the nomination of priests of heretical beliefs to the different sees that now fell vacant and in the directions all the bishops were ordered to give their clergy concerning the matter of their parochial sermons. Priests who any longer prayed for the pope were to be imprisoned. Bishops and clergy were, every Sunday for three months and thenceforward twice a quarter, to preach and proclaim the Royal Supremacy. No sermons were to be preached in refutation of heresies concerning purgatory, pilgrimages, the veneration of the saints. This last, indeed, was to be discouraged and the cult of relics too. The Ten Articles, about whose lack of orthodoxy no one, thanks to Dr. Messenger,² will henceforward have any doubts, were imposed and, a practical corollary to the injunction about veneration of the saints, all holy days during harvest time (i.e., from July 1st to September 29th) were abolished and the special patronal feasts of all the parish churches throughout the kingdom ordered to be kept on the one day.³ The fact that the ancient religion was undergoing a change was thus brought to the consciousness of every Catholic in the land.

Such is the background against which we must study the effect of the Act⁴ (of March, 1536) dissolving the lesser monasteries. For months before that date Cromwell's agents, two clerical blackguards, whose crowded hour⁵

² *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, by E. C. Messenger, Ph.D.

³ This last measure caused a great deal of resentment. When at Watton, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, the priest omitted to announce that the following Thursday—October 12th—would be the feast of St. Wilfrid, John Hallam, a farmer of the parish, called out to ask the reason. The priest explained it was by the king's orders and immediately there was a riotous outbreak. When, that same night, the news came that Beverley had risen Watton rose too.

⁴ 27 H. VIII, c. 28.

⁵ In three months Leigh "visited" all the smaller houses in the nine counties of Wilts, Hants, Berks, Surrey, Bedford, Cambridge, Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk.

had finally come, had toured the country in an endeavour to frame a case against the religious on moral and social grounds. Since the Act commissioners appointed under it had gone round assessing the value of the plunder, seeing to the expulsion of the monks and nuns and the liquidation of the material side of the revolution.

The whole country slowly began to seethe. There was already an immense social discontent, complaints about the new laws regulating the manufacture of cloth, sheep rearing, and the sale of meat, and discontent too about enclosures. The pillage that every man saw going on before his eyes put the finishing touch to the trouble, and soon there was not a village that did not hum with rumour and prophecy. The plate of all the parish churches, it was said, was next to be confiscated, their gold and silver to be replaced by tin or brass. All parish churches were to be destroyed, as the abbey churches were being destroyed, one alone excepted for every five miles. There was to be a new tax on baptisms, marriages and funerals, "on every child and chimley," a sworn enquiry into all men's private property, while henceforth no poor man should ever eat white bread, goose or capon save by the king's leave. The priests, it was said, would rise against the king, "the parish priests should rule England three days and three nights, and then the white falcon should come out of the north-west and kill almost all the priests, and they that should escape would be fain to hide their crowns with the filth of beasts because they would not be known." In April there were riots in Somerset, in August in Cumberland, and in September in Norfolk, while Yorkshire "sputtered with riot" throughout the year.

The gentry too—the unpaid agents through whom the crown then governed, and upon whom the administration of the laws depended—had their grievances. They lost heavily, in many cases, by the suppression of the abbeys, they shared the discontent aroused by such measures as the Durham Palatinate Act which swept away old local liberties and privileges. They resented the Statute of Uses which seriously restricted their power of willing, and the statute by which the king accepted the Earl of Northumberland's enforced bequest of all his inheritance had about it a quite new and terrible menace for his fellows.

This first suppression of the monasteries affected 327 abbeys and priories, 224 of men and 103 of women, and a matter of 2,000 religious. The two counties most affected were Yorkshire (fifty-three suppressions) and Lincolnshire (thirty-seven suppressions), and it was in the last-named county, where already the immense plunder of £9,000 had been taken, that the first real explosion came in October, 1536.

The Lincolnshire Rising would require—and deserve—an article all to itself, so much light does it throw on the Pilgrimage and on the king's policy in its suppression. And the pattern of its events was largely the pattern of events in Yorkshire. But in Yorkshire the gentry were in general more willing to join with the insurgents, and, in Aske's army at any rate, discipline was better and there was none of the ferocity that, in Lincolnshire, showed now and again. The way the rising began at Louth and Caister is none the less typical of the way the whole affair moved.

Towards the end of September, 1536, three sets of commissioners were at work in the county, one assessing property and collecting a newly voted tax, one dissolving the monasteries, and one enquiring into the lives of the clergy and their fitness for their work. When this last commission arrived at Louth on Monday, October 2nd, they found the town in uproar. The vicar had been so unfavourably impressed by what he had seen of the commissioners' work at Bolingbroke in the previous week that he had made it the subject of his Sunday sermon. Whereupon the parishioners had set a guard upon the parish church and its treasures. When the commissioners arrived they were seized and forced to take an oath "to be true to the commons," and their papers were publicly burned along with a number of heretical books. The town officials were also similarly sworn and one Sir William Skipwith, the first gentleman whose name is connected with the movement. The dissolution commission was chased from a neighbouring convent of Cistercian nuns and the nuns restored. Finally, the sixty parish priests who had come in to Louth for the visitation were also sworn, and sworn, too, to raise their parishes. All this was the spontaneous activity of a single busy day.

The next day all the men from 16 to 60 assembled at

the cross and, three thousand strong, marched towards Caister, fifteen miles and more to the north. Caister, too, was full of priests, 160 of them, come in for the visitation due to begin there that day, and by the time the Louth contingent arrived Caister had risen, sworn in all the gentry that were handy and the royal commissioners themselves. A declaration made to these captives by "a gentleman" is the first statement of the motives and aims that lay behind the movement. How far it committed anyone besides the man who made it is matter for argument. The commons, he declared, were willing to take the king as Supreme Head of the Church, and that he should have the first fruits and tithes of every benefice, and also the subsidy granted to him: but he must take no more money of the commons during his life and suppress no more abbeys: also Cromwell and the heretical bishops—Cranmer of Canterbury, Longland of Lincoln, Hilsey of Rochester, Goodrich of Ely, Latimer of Worcester, and Brown of Dublin—were to be given up to the commons.

Very rapidly the rest of the county followed the example set at Louth, and Lincoln—where there was a certain amount of artillery—was occupied without resistance. En route the insurgents strove to press into active co-operation the religious of the greater abbeys which, as yet, no statute had touched. Notable among these was the great Premonstratensian house of Barlings whose abbot, Matthew Mackerel, one of the day's great preachers, was Bishop of Chalcedon and auxiliary to the much hated Bishop of Lincoln.⁶ By direct threats they finally won from them provisions, money and even the presence of some of the religious with their forces. Nowhere, however, in Lincolnshire, did the religious spontaneously assist the rising.

By October 8th the insurgents had mustered 40,000 men—10,000 or so of them armed. Then came crisis, swiftly, decisively. The news of the rising had reached the court four days before this, and by October 9th the Duke of Suffolk, who had been sent north to deal with it, had got as far as Huntingdon. On that day he wrote

⁶ John Longland, reputed (untruly) to be the original prompter of Henry in the matter of the divorce. He was the king's confessor. At Horncastle the rebels murdered his chancellor, the clergy looking on.

to the rebels. Instant submission alone could save them from a terrible vengeance.

Suffolk had only five thousand men, of whom only 3,000 were armed, and though he was moving rapidly (he was at Stamford on the Tuesday, October 10th) he had as yet no guns. The rebels were forty thousand but they paid, now, for the unwilling leaders whom they had scared into joining them. From the moment they marched into Lincoln there had been division, the gentry undecided and determined to do nothing before some indication had come in of how the king was taking the matter. Suffolk's letter, then, was not unwelcome. It gave the gentry their chance. A plot of the commons, suspicious by now of the coming desertion, to kill the leaders failed and with the leaders' announcement that until the king's answer to their demands was known they would move no further, the host began to break up. It was already in all the confusion of dispersal when, October 12th, Lancaster Herald rode in with the king's proclamation ordering all loyal men back to their homes. This brought the movement effectively to an end. Five days later Suffolk was in Lincoln with his army, and though the county was still heaving with unrest not a man had stirred to oppose or hinder him.

The king's satisfaction at this speedy success was, however, premature. A much more serious affair was in progress in Yorkshire. It had begun on October 8th, just a week after the riots at Louth, and in the ensuing five days the whole county, from Beverley to Durham and Westmorland, was in motion. The leading figure in this Yorkshire rising—the Pilgrimage of Grace properly so called—was Robert Aske, a younger son of one of the great Yorkshire families, first cousin to Clifford, Earl of Cumberland, who at the time was Henry's "man" in the north.

Aske, a man thirty-five or thirty-six years of age, who was a prosperous barrister, was riding south for the opening of the new law term when, on October 4th, he was halted by a party of the Lincolnshire rebels and compelled to take the oath and make one with them. How far he knew what was coming in Yorkshire, how far he was already committed, is not known. Meanwhile, these rebels were certainly less dangerous to property if led than wandering about, armed and leaderless hordes.

And Aske sympathized *ex corde* with their aims. After a day spent assisting the Lincolnshire rebels to raise Humberside he managed to get back to Yorkshire, hoping to delay the rising until the king's mind was known. From the beginning it would seem that Aske had not rebellion in mind but rather a strong demonstration under arms to assure the king of support once he showed his own desire be freed of the evil counsellors who were misgoverning in his name. To the end the view persists, and it underlies the whole movement, that Henry is a good-natured if sensual man—"a napyll a day and a fair wench to dally withal" summed it up—whom low-born wretches like Cromwell and heretics like Cranmer held in spiritual thrall. Once the king knew that the Pilgrims merely wished to put things back to where they were at the beginning of the reign he would no doubt gladly avail himself of the strength of the movement now developing.

Aske was back in Lincoln on October 8th and 9th in quest of news. Here, for his fancied desertion three days earlier, his life was in danger. Flight alone saved him and after a two days' wait, occasioned by the flooding of the rivers, he returned into Yorkshire and on the 10th and 12th of October roused all his own countryside, the districts where the Don and the Aire flow into the Ouse and the neighbourhood of Howden. Beverley had already risen—on Sunday, October 8th—and "pressed" William Stapleton into service as captain. To both centres, Beverley and Howden, men began to come in, marching behind their parish crosses, and then Holderness rose, many of its gentry fleeing to Hull. On October 13th, Aske and Stapleton joined forces and while the main body made for York a powerful detachment turned to take Hull. Both were successful. On October 16th Aske occupied York, the second city in the kingdom, without opposition and was solemnly received at the Minster. Three days later Hull, too, surrendered.

From York Aske put out the second of his signed proclamations,⁷ with a list of articles containing the Pilgrims' grievances, and a new, detailed and definite oath which all had to swear. By these three acts he gave the Pilgrimage its definite objective and deter-

⁷ The first proclamation had been made a few days earlier. It is in very general terms.

mined the spirit in which it was henceforward to move. It is not too much to say that it was Aske who made it, what he himself had called it, a Pilgrimage of Grace. Breathing into it his own simple religious idealism, his own selfless endeavour, he gave it its soul. The three acts therefore call for more than a mere mention.

In the proclamation it was explained that not taxes but the presence of "simple and evil disposed persons" in the king's council had caused the dissatisfaction. They had already worked upon the king to bring in innovations destructive of the Faith and the king's honour, and were now planning to destroy and spoil the whole body of the realm. "For this pilgrimage we have taken it for the preservation of Christ's church, of this realm of England, the king our sovereign lord and the nobility and commons of the same *and to the entent to make petition to the king's highness.*"⁸

The articles are five in number. There is the usual reference to Cromwell and his fellow grafters, and the complaint about the heretic bishops, with a special reference to Longland of Lincoln. There is the demand for repeal of the Statute of Uses and the tax on horned cattle, and finally there is a demand that the suppression of the abbeys shall cease, with the detailed explanation first that the suppression entails a serious diminution of the honour due to God and next that the poor henceforth must go unrelieved. But more than all the rest, the new "Oath of the Honourable Men" is the certificate of what Aske was and what he meant the Pilgrimage to be.

Ye shall not enter into this our Pilgrimage of Grace for the Commonwealth, but only for the love that ye do bear unto Almighty God his faith, and to Holy Church militant and the maintenance thereof, to the preservation of the king's person and his issue, to the purifying of the nobility, and to expulse all villein blood and evil counsellors against the commonwealth from his Grace and his Privy Council of the same. And that ye shall not enter into our said Pilgrimage for no particular profit to your self, nor to do any displeasure to any private person, but by counsel of the commonwealth, nor slay nor murder for no envy, but in your hearts put away all fear and dread, and take afore you the Cross of Christ, and in your hearts His faith, the Restitution of the Church, the suppression of these Heretics and their opinions, by all the holy contents of this book.⁹

⁸ Italics mine.

⁹ Dodds, I, 182.

The most striking result of the occupation of York was the restoration of the dispossessed religious. Amid general rejoicings, with cheers and torchlight processions, they were escorted to their old homes and "though it were never so late they sang matins the same night."

At midnight however (October 16th-17th) there arrived an envoy from the commander of the nearest fortress that remained loyal to the king, Pontefract Castle, twenty miles and more to the south on the road to London. This was Lord Darcy, a veteran soldier of close on seventy, one of the principal lords of the north, and for many years, under both the king and his father Henry VII, in high command on the Scottish border. He had been "pro-divorce" at first but had split with Norfolk on the point that the question was one for the Church to decide. Later he had protested in the House of Lords that it was none of Parliament's business to interfere with doctrine. He had, more than any other peer, been an outspoken champion of ecclesiastical independence. All which had earned him exile from Parliament but a kind of captivity at court which had lasted for three years and more. He had indeed only recently returned to the north. What line was he going to take now? So far (October 1st-16th) he had managed to keep the country around Pontefract from rising. But he had only three hundred men to garrison the castle, not a gun ready to shoot, no powder even so, no gunners, few bows and scanty arrows. The bridge was in a bad way, provisions were hard to obtain, the country was hostile and sullenly waiting its chance. His three hundred men sympathized with the Pilgrims. And, at heart, no doubt Darcy sympathized too. His envoy had two things to ask from the Pilgrims' leader—a copy of the articles and a promise to avert the march from Pontefract. But the envoy did more than this. He was heart and soul with the movement and he gave Aske the valuable information that the gentry at Pontefract were ready to join in if only a sufficient show of force was used against them.

The next day—October 17th—while Darcy was writing to the king, what was true enough, that "we must in a few days either yield or lose our lives" and that "there is no likelihood of vanquishing the commons

here," the new oath was sent throughout the north to unite the movement which by now had aroused the northern counties as far as the very border.

In Northumberland the priory of Hexham had been a centre of opposition since, on September 28th, the Augustinian canons, arms in hand, had put the royal commissioners to flight.¹⁰ The Percies rose in October. Nidderdale and Richmondshire had risen in the week that saw Lincolnshire's collapse. Barnard Castle had been taken on the day that York was occupied, and on that same day—October 15th—Durham and Kendal also rose. Two days later than this siege was laid to Skipton, where lay the Earl of Cumberland, and to Scarborough the only other castle in Yorkshire that still held out. Jervaux Abbey was "pressed" on the 16th and on the 18th Salley in Lancashire restored, the shrine this, surely, of the whole movement and, it is said, the source of the famous Pilgrims' Song. Finally, on the day that Hull fell—October 19th—the Westmorland pilgrims, who had previously raised Kirkby Stephen, entered Penrith. It was just eleven days since Roger Kitchin, ringing "the common bell" at Beverley, had brought together the "expectant folk" of whom the fields around had for days before been full. Then, on Saturday, October 21st, Darcy surrendered Pontefract after much parleying. All in the castle took the oath and, under the conduct of the old soldier, drill began to be the order of the day.

And now came the first sign of the royal reaction to the news—the arrival at Pontefract of Lancaster Herald, hoping to disperse the Pilgrims with an announcement of the collapse in Lincolnshire and the proclamation he had there made. But Aske prevented him from acting and instead gave him the message that they were going "to London upon pilgrimage to the king's highness" to petition "full restitution of Christ's church of all wrongs done to it" and the expulsion of low born counsellors.

When the Pilgrimage began at Beverley on October 8th, the nearest royal commanders were Darcy at Pontefract, the Earl of Shrewsbury at Nottingham, and Suffolk,

¹⁰ "We be twenty brethren in this house," they announced, "and we shall die all or that they shall have this house."

who was making for Lincolnshire, at Huntingdon. At the news of the new movement Shrewsbury, in accordance with instructions, moved immediately on Yorkshire, hoping to gather more men as he went. On October 17th he was at Newark with 7,000 men and on the 21st—the day of Darcy's surrender—he had reached Scrooby, still twenty-five miles away from Pontefract. The danger had appeared so great to Henry that Norfolk, who had been already summoned and then sent home again, was once more called to court and, re-commissioned, set off in haste for the north, dreading that Shrewsbury might advance so rapidly as to find himself in presence of the Pilgrim host with altogether inadequate forces.

Which is exactly what had happened. Norfolk reached Newark, alone, on October 23rd, on which day Shrewsbury had got as far as the bridge at Rossington four or five miles on the London side of Doncaster. Ten miles away from him, at Hampole, was the vanguard of the Pilgrims—10,000 strong and all armed—under Sir Thomas Percy, one of the disinherited brothers of the sick Earl of Northumberland. The main body still lay at Pontefract five miles to the rear. Norfolk, still travelling with only his personal attendants, sent an urgent message to Shrewsbury to hold the Pilgrims with talk of a truce and on Tuesday, October 24th, the Pilgrims received Shrewsbury's suggestion that a conference might avert bloodshed. After much discussion they agreed to a conference, to which Shrewsbury replied with an exhortation to submit to mercy. Otherwise they must be prepared for battle when Norfolk arrived.

A long debate followed among the chiefs of the Pilgrimage. Their forces numbered in all 40,000. Shrewsbury had but 8,000 at the most. Both armies were of the same type and the issue could not have been doubtful. But Shrewsbury bore the king's commission. To attack him would be a definite abandonment of the role of pilgrims, an open act of rebellion and treason. The Durham lords, however, fought hard for the policy of attack. Aske argued strongly against them. Why else had the Pilgrims assembled except that the king might hear their case? Conference was now offered by the king's representatives and, surely, conference was the logical next step in the Pilgrimage? Darcy supported him and their view prevailed. Shrewsbury was

told that they were prepared to treat and Norfolk, only fourteen miles away by now, at Welbeck, set out immediately for Shrewsbury's camp to conduct the negotiations—in plain English, to tell what lies might be necessary and to confirm them with oaths of appropriate strength. As witness his famous letter to the king, written that same night ere he set off :

“ Sir most humbly I beseech you to take in good part whatsoever promises I shall make unto the rebels . . . for surely I shall observe no part thereof for any respect of that others might call mine honour distained, longer than I and my company with my lord marquis may be assembled together, thinking and reputed that none oath nor promise made nor policy to serve you mine only master and sovereign can distain me. . . .” How desperate indeed the situation of the king's forces was at the moment a later letter of Norfolk's shows, written to the king after the conference. He is apologizing that he has not destroyed the enemy in battle, but makes the point that, even without a fight, he has just as effectually dispersed them. Never indeed has he done the king a greater service. Shrewsbury's “ fast hurrying forward to bring us into the most barren country of the realm ” jeopardized all. What caused Norfolk to treat with the rebels was not fear but bad weather, lack of lodging and provisions—“ not a load of hay nor oats nor peas nor beans within five miles ”—and of fuel. Moreover, Doncaster was full of the plague. It was not possible to give battle without certain defeat. He had no cavalry and they “ all the flower of the north.” Had it come to a fight he would have been at their mercy.

Norfolk, then, did the trick. He had the great advantage in his treachery that the Pilgrims trusted him. One of “ the olde blode ” and an enemy of Cromwell he must, they thought, be with them at heart. And as one of the heroes of Flodden, the victory over the Scots that had protected the border for a generation, he was popular throughout the north.

There were two conferences, one on Thursday and the other on Friday, October 27th and 28th. The five points of the York articles were put to Norfolk at the first meeting and on the second day discussed in detail in a long conference on Doncaster bridge. Of that detail we know nothing for certain. Darcy afterwards stated that

Norfolk had declared his sympathy with the movement, which is likely enough. The outcome was a truce. The Pilgrims' case was to be put before Henry by Norfolk and two of the chiefs, Sir Ralph Ellerker and Robert Bowes. Both armies were to disperse within two days, and to observe a truce until the envoys returned. By the Sunday, two days later, the last of the Pilgrims had left Pontefract, and Shrewsbury's army had also broken up.

It was the best part of six weeks before Norfolk returned with the king's reply. Henry's first attitude was all fury and disappointment. His honour was soiled by this parleying with traitors. No rebels had been killed and only by their blood could his honour be restored. As he learnt more of the real state of things he recognized that here was a combination far more serious than the affair in Lincolnshire, and he set himself to break up, by delay and intrigue, the forces that he could not otherwise have escaped. The consistent faith of the bulk of the Pilgrims in the king's personal good will was here of the greatest assistance, their genuine belief that Henry was the victim of evil counsellors and that the whole reformation movement was a devilry of Cromwell and Cranmer.

The king's great aim was to set the leaders one against the other and to sow dissension between the gentry and the commons—this last a task that should be easy.¹¹ There was a plan to have Aske murdered or captured by treachery and sent up to London. Both Norfolk and Lord Hussey, at Norfolk's suggestion, strove to enlist Darcy to this end. His replies are refreshing reading. To Hussey he wrote: "I cannot do it in no wise, for I have made promise to the contrary, and my coat was never hitherto stained with any such blot. And my lord's grace your master knoweth well enough what a nobleman's promise is[!] . . . and if I might have two dukedoms for my labour I would not consent to have such a spot in my coat." To Norfolk he was even blunter: "Alas, my good lord, that ever ye, being a man of so much honour and great experience, should advise or choose me a man to be of any such sort or fashion to betray or

¹¹ Pickthorne (*Henry VIII*, page 344) notes Henry's various letters and proclamations as "admirably designed to foment the nervousness of the gentry and the suspicions of the commons."

disserve any living man, Frenchman, Scot, yea, or a Turk; of my faith, to get and win to me and mine heirs four of the best duke's lands in France, or to be king there, I would not do it to any living person."

The long delay, and the known attempts to tamper with the truce, were provoking stirs and alarms throughout Yorkshire, and though the moment was not yet come for Henry to show his hand and allow Norfolk to return, he felt compelled to send back, with a verbal message, Ellerker and Bowes. The reply that they brought was referred by Darcy and Aske to the coming meeting, at York on November 21st, of the great council of the Pilgrims. This was a body of 800 members in which sat, besides various lords and knights, representatives of every wapentake and parish in Yorkshire. For the first time for many centuries, and for the last, a freely elected body of Englishmen were to discuss the political and religious problems of the hour and the government's solutions of them. This feature alone of the Pilgrimage of Grace makes it a thing apart in the history of rebellion in England. Its deliberations and decisions give the general historian what is almost his solitary opportunity to study the natural reaction of ordinary Englishmen, clergy no less than laity, speaking their mind in security and freedom, to the first attempts to destroy their traditional faith.

The message which the envoys brought was altogether unsatisfactory. It was little more than a string of reproaches in the style of the Lincolnshire proclamation and the news that Norfolk was coming at the end of the month with the real reply. The envoys, who had, since meeting Henry, become more royalist than ever, explained that, the Pilgrimage having thus accomplished all it set out to do, the Pilgrims should permanently disperse. But Sir Robert Constable now produced a letter from Cromwell, scarcely a week old, written to the commander of Scarborough Castle, and, the envoys being turned out, laid it before the council. It was in flat contradiction with the whole tone of their message for Cromwell declared that the king was determined, if the Pilgrims did not submit unconditionally, to kill the lot. Whereupon there was a great debate, Constable arguing that they should not meet Norfolk at Doncaster but raise the whole host again and advance under arms. Aske

stood by his old position and made the old arguments. As for the treachery of Cromwell's letter, was it not Cromwell whom, all along, they had blamed as the source of all the evil?

The Council finally decided to meet Norfolk on December 5th and that on the 3rd a new council should meet at Pontefract to prepare a detailed list of grievances—the king had complained that those sent with Norfolk were too general. Then for two days it gave itself to other, and stormy discussions, resolving that it could accept no pardon except by Act of Parliament and that the new Parliament must meet at a place to which all might come and go with safety.

The council at Pontefract duly took place over the week-end of Saturday, December 2nd to Monday, December 4th. The most piquant feature of it was the conduct of the Archbishop of York who had fled to the castle when the movement first began and had been taken along with Darcy and, nominally at any rate, had joined the Pilgrims. He was the typical Tudor bishop, a clerical lawyer and timeserver who had received the see, vacant by Wolsey's death, in return for good work done in the cause of the divorce. Now, between fear that the Pilgrims would kill him and fear of the king should he survive them, he was beside himself, and to be forced into a public declaration of Catholic teaching on such delicate matter as the Royal Supremacy or the lawfulness of taking arms against the sovereign was the last thing he desired.

In the articles resolved on at Pontefract we have indeed "a complete view of government wholly incompatible with that which Henry and Cromwell were realizing."¹² In the completeness of their survey lies their unique interest, to which nothing short of their actual text can do justice.¹³ The Royal Supremacy was to be abolished, heresies repressed, the abbeys restored, the heretical bishops and Cromwell put to death. The Lady Mary was to be acknowledged as heir. Various

¹² Pickthorne, *op. cit.*, 345.

¹³ They were printed, for the first time (and have not, I think, ever been reprinted) in Dodds, *op. cit.*, Vol I, pp. 346-385, with much explanatory matter. They should have formed part of this article, but it has already grown too long.

social grievances were to be remedied and the parliamentary representation of the Yorkshire boroughs restored. There should be, "and that shortly," a parliament at Nottingham or York and the pardon should be by Act of Parliament. The Statute of Uses should be repealed and with it all the treasons enacted since 1530. The Common Law was to have its ancient superiority and the new threatening introduction of (Roman) Civil procedure be stayed. The ecclesiastical articles are interesting too.¹⁴ They are a detailed demand for the restoration of Catholicism and the serious prosecution of heresy. "We think that by the laws of the doctors and consent of christian people the pope of Rome hath been taken for the head of the church and the vicar of christ and so ought to be taken," one of them runs. And the doctors end with a plea for the restoration of the study of the canon law, lately banned from the universities. It is not without interest that Aske put in an appearance at this conference of the clergy, with an offer of a book by St. John Fisher to assist them in their work.

As Norfolk travelled north to this second meeting at Doncaster he realized to the full the difficulty of the task before him. The king still, in public, clung to the pretence that false rumours about new taxes were the sole cause of the Pilgrimage and he stood by his demand that the Pilgrims should submit unconditionally. If they demurred Norfolk was to keep them in talk, watch his opportunity, and attack. But as Norfolk got nearer his destination he realized that he had no chance whatever of winning Darcy or Aske to his side. He began to wonder if the Pilgrims would even consent to receive him, and knew that, if they prepared to fight, the king was lost. To his letters outlining the situation Henry replied with a furious reminder that the duke had offered to perjure himself whenever necessary. Finally, however, he gave him leave to promise, should all else fail, a general pardon and a free parliament for September, 1537, at a place chosen by the king. Norfolk was so to manage the concession that the Pilgrims would be persuaded that really this was all that they were after.

The decisive meetings took place at Doncaster on

¹⁴ These too have been printed in full in Dodds, Vol. I, pp. 383-385.

December 5th and 6th. Of what passed at the first of them—Aske was not present—we know nothing. At the second Norfolk declared the pardon and the promise of a parliament and then, so much for his diplomacy, the Pilgrims proceeded to work through the articles just drawn up. Of this discussion again we have no detailed account. But we know that Norfolk pledged a restoration of the suppressed monasteries.

When on December 7th Aske made the terms known to the Pilgrims' representatives at Pontefract there was a good deal of murmuring. The commons wished to see the pardon sealed with the great seal, and a definite declaration that the promised parliament would meet at York. Nor were they pleased that the restoration of the abbeys was only promised. Aske, however, persuaded them to be patient and when, next day the 8th, the royal herald read the pardon they tore off their Pilgrims' badges, crying: "We will all wear no badge nor sign but the badge of our sovereign lord," and on Saturday, December 9th dispersed to their homes. The heralds began to tour the north proclaiming the pardon.

This dispersal we can now see to have been the end of the Pilgrims' cause, but this was not equally obvious to contemporaries, and at the news of the terms of the agreement fury once more seized the king. Not a single rebel had been put to death and a pledge had been given regarding the monasteries! Henry was too wily publicly to repudiate Norfolk while the deceit was profiting him the dispersal, and, even the process of the suppression was slowed down. What Henry wanted was a new slight rising, to give an excuse for going back on the promises and to justify the desired and intended executions; and his schemes to detach the leaders and to break the commons' trust in them went forward. The pardon was vague, it misrepresented the causes and nature of the movement and it ignored the real points at issue. Whence a new discontent as its terms became known. The commons, again, had no great hope or trust in the coming parliament, while the gentry staked all upon it. Tax collectors began to appear in the north, and preachers from the south eloquent about the heinousness of rebellion. There was every chance that the king would have his desired rising soon enough. Meanwhile, by intrigue and flattery, he strove to detach the leaders. Aske himself was commanded to court and had the

friendly, even affectionate reception, that convinced him more than ever of the king's simple good will.

Then, in the January of 1537, as at Beverley the Pilgrims began to assemble, Aske, who had just returned from court, hastened to prevent them spoiling all by their tactless haste. There was to be, at Pentecost, the promised parliament, a free convocation of the clergy and the coronation of the new queen Jane Seymour. All this to take place at York. For a time Aske prevailed over the suspicions of his old followers. And in other cases the gentry suppressed the little risings as they began. The king's diplomacy was already working to perfection when, despite Aske, John Hallam and Sir Francis Bigod, persuaded of Henry's falseness, once more began to raise the East Riding. They seized, but failed to hold, Scarborough, and they were finally taken and their slight forces dispersed. Norfolk could now return to the divided and uneasy north and the king, absolved of course from the promises made at Doncaster, could see his honour restored by the necessary executions.

Into the detail of the process—it filled the next six months—there is not space to go. Norfolk's instructions were to go through the north administering a new oath of allegiance, and, finding out those really responsible for the movement, to punish as much as he dare, and to work continually to widen the breach between the gentry and the commons. Nowhere did he and his army meet with opposition. All took the oath wherever it was proffered and when a new insurrection—social this time—broke out among the oppressed peasantry of Cumberland, he was able to march his army to the relief of Carlisle, while Yorkshire—sullen, hostile but divided now by internal suspicions—remained passive. The phrase "savage massacres" has been used of Norfolk's suppression of the Pilgrimage. It is something of an exaggeration. Norfolk knew too well the heat of the fire that burned below the ash on which he trod not to walk delicately. He simply dared not risk, by fulfilling Henry's ardent desire for blood and yet more blood, the reassembly of the Pilgrims. In all 151 people were put to death in Yorkshire and the north (74 of them at Carlisle, the most pitiful case of all), another 34 at Lincoln, and 31 in London. Many again died in the London prisons awaiting trial and seven hundred possibly were killed in the assault on Carlisle.

Among those executed were the six abbots of Barlings, Kirkstead, Whalley, Salley, Jervaux and Fountains. Sir Thomas Percy, Sir Robert Constable and Lord Darcy too were among the victims. And, of course, Aske, was not spared. Almost to the last his faith in the king had persisted and it served to make his arrest an easy matter. As witness, once more, a letter from Norfolk, this time to Cromwell: "I have by policy brought him to desire me to give him license to ride to London, and have promised to write a letter to your Lordship for him: which letter I pray you take of like sort as ye did the other I wrote for Sir Thomas Percy. If neither of them both come never to this country again I think neither true nor honest men would be sorry thereof, nor in likewise for my lord Darcy nor Sir Robert Constable." Aske, he thought, was probably responsible for the Articles of Pontefract, Darcy and Constable their great supporters. If the king wanted evidence against them let him give Aske private interviews "and wade with him with fair words, as though he had great trust in him. This would make him cough out as much as he knows."

Such was the manner of the final treachery to the leader of the Pilgrimage, "the great captain." He went up to London, with letters from Norfolk, on March 24th. On April 7th he was arrested, and on May 16th, along with Constable and seven others, put on his trial for high treason. The indictment charged them in the first place with conspiracy to deprive the king of his title of supreme head of the church, to compel the king to summon a parliament and convocation, and to amend diverse wholesome laws. Aske's real crime in Henry's eyes was his reliance on the royal word and the publicity he had given the royal promises, inducing others to put faith in them and thereby making more difficult the king's intended repudiation. "Your reasonable petitions shall be ordered in Parliament," he had said to the commons, persuading them against a revival of the Pilgrimage. This was now the proof that Aske "continues in his traitor's heart and rejoices in his treason."

The prisoners were, of course, condemned and Aske sent north for execution. At York, on July 12th, 1537, he was hanged "and on the other side all the trumpets sounded."¹⁵

¹⁵ Dodds, op. cit.

CATHOLIC ACTION AND THE WORKER

BY E. M. WALL.

DESPITE many recent suggestions to change the word "action" in the term Catholic Action, the fact remains that it *is* action. The Holy Father himself has clearly said that organizations which aim solely at developing the interior life are not organisms of Catholic Action. The work of Catholic Action is an active apostolate, a Christianization by the laity, working under the Hierarchy, of the society in which they live. Moreover, the object of Catholic Action is spiritual: to spread the Christian faith and Christian morals by words and example. How then can it include social action which is concerned primarily with the material needs of man?

If the origin of the term "Catholic Action" be traced back through the pronouncements of the last five Popes, it will be found that quite often they have referred to Social Action and this is particularly the case with Leo XIII and Pius X. Thus, for instance, Pius X wrote in 1905: "Our predecessor, Leo XIII, pointed out, notably in the famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum* and in later documents, the object to which Catholic Action should be specially devoted, namely, the practical solution of the social question according to Christian principles." This then was the reason thirty-one years ago, and this is the reason to-day, why Catholic Action must turn its attention particularly to the solution of the social question: because its object is the salvation of souls, and because souls are in immediate danger if this pressing need be neglected. Pius XI himself has stressed this many times, as when writing to the Patriarch of Lisbon:

The fields open to Catholic Action are many, since nothing that is part of the Christian life is foreign to it; but certain tasks are more urgent in that they respond to the needs of the times. Among these we count the assistance of the working-classes. This should be material as well as spiritual, though the latter will ever be the primary concern . . . (Catholic Action's) special concern will be the infusion of

definite Catholic principles, and in particular the teaching of this Holy See as set out in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*.¹

In a word, the Church of Christ is of its nature bound to concern itself with the regeneration of society when social abuses and disorders hinder the way to grace in this world and to glory beyond. And for that reason has the Holy Father addressed to the whole Catholic world his encyclical: "On reconstructing the Social Order and perfecting it conformably to the precepts of the Gospel." Finally, in one of his most recent letters on Catholic Action (to Cardinal Leme, the Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro) Pius XI has insisted once again:

We most earnestly exhort that a very special care be given to the lower classes, such as industrial and agricultural workers; and this because they as such were indeed the object of predilection to the Divine Heart of Jesus, and they have evoked and still evoke the maternal solicitude of the Church who feels the greatest compassion when confronted with the miseries and sufferings of their lives, and who is anxious because of the great spiritual dangers to which they are exposed by the intensive propaganda of anti-religious and anti-social doctrines.²

THE POSITION IN ENGLAND.

We in England are not exempt from this universal "field-order" of the General of the forces of Catholic Action. It therefore behoves us to consider, briefly, the condition of affairs in England, i.e., in what surroundings we have to work. Speaking broadly we may say that there are two chief reforming elements in this country. The first of these is one which appeals and works for a reform of the economic system, and which in the hands of Left Wingers would lead ultimately to revolution. True enough, the Pope himself wants the economic system reformed,³ but whereas *he* wants it because economic practice is not in conformity with the ethical and moral principles which should govern it, the economic reformers have a purely utilitarian basis for their

¹ To be found in *The Pope and Catholic Action* (C.T.S.), p. 18.

² Dated October 28th, 1935; published in the *Osservatore Romano* on February 16th, 1936.

³ Cf. *Quadragesimo Anno*, §99 ff.

crusade. The economic system which grew to maturity in the last century, fostered by the prevailing policy of *laissez-faire*, has broken down and must be repaired! The second approach to what is called in the large "the Social Question" is along the lines of philanthropic humanitarianism—the cold charity of free milk and birth control clinics. Mr. Dawson draws attention to the quasi-religious element in this humanitarianism and says that "there is a real danger that English religion, at least English Protestantism, may allow itself to be identified with an enthusiasm for social justice and reform which is hardly distinguishable from the creed of secular humanitarianism."⁴ The Catholic social reformer shares most of their ideals with non-Catholic social workers—but with a difference. It is the spirit that quickeneth. All these ideals could be realized on a natural plane, in the cold alpha-beta-gamma-delta *Brave New World*, if the ideals were ends in themselves. For the Catholic they cannot be; and it is here that we begin to realize the immensity of the task which lies before us.

Our outlook is essentially more fundamental. The abolition of poverty, the destruction of slums, leisure for all, and so on, are only means to an end, or rather manifestations of success in the mission which Christ has given the Church. We are continually striving to fight our way back to the position which was lost for us by Adam; and the Catholic social reformer realizes that what is required more than rationalization, more than economic efficiency, more than reduction of the number of unemployed, is *grace*. So the Catholic social reformer calls simultaneously for a profession of faith and a reform of morals, particularly for a reform of morals. We base our whole social doctrine on the personality of man, the essential dignity of man flowing therefrom—and, working from this, demand that everyone treat his neighbour, particularly employers their employees, with full recognition of what this personality implies. We have to create a social conscience in the English people, and this will be no easy matter. Moreover, it must be an effective social conscience, one which will influence the will of the community. We affirm

⁴ *Religion and the Modern State*, p. 108.

that at present no such social conscience exists in England, and in support of this we allege one outstanding example where the social conscience would long ago have had its effect. In 1919 there was held in Washington the first General Conference of the International Labour Organization, and the Washington Hours' Convention was approved almost unanimously by the delegates, subject to their Government's ratification. It is now 1936 and in England the ratification of this most important measure has gone no further than vague promises—and that, as they admit themselves, is due to the obstructive policy of the National Confederation of Employers' Organizations and of the Federation of British Industries. They have been allowed to do this because there is no widespread appreciation of the necessity for such ratification. Worse, there is no realization of the important influence we would have on the ratification by other countries. Most of the European countries have ratified the Convention, *on the condition* that such ratification only becomes law when Great Britain does likewise.⁵

That the formation of a social conscience will be no easy matter is clear, too, for those with facile panaceas appealing to the natural man, to the "economic man," are far more likely to gain public support and a following than our advocacy of a spiritual reformation. Nevertheless, we must face the task; Pius XI, speaking to the Directors of Catholic Action in Rome, said:

Until the social question and, first of all, the labour-problem, shall cease to be a merely material question, an affair of economics or, as they say, of the stomach and digestion, and until it becomes a question regarding conscience and human dignity, and in a word a supremely moral question, the Church, the Holy See, the Hierarchy, the Apostolate, for the sake of the divine mandate which is theirs, not only cannot refuse to themselves to come to the succour of all, but cannot dispense themselves from doing so, considering this as a definite and primary duty.⁶

FACING THE TASK.

What means are we to use to fulfil the Holy Father's

⁵ The main facts are to be found in *The Washington Hours' Convention* published by the League of Nations Union.

⁶ *Manual of Catholic Action*, Civardi-Martindale, p. 33.

commission? Mgr. Civardi has in summary form a valuable contribution to make. "To the solution of all those problems which fall under the general heading of 'Social Question' Catholic Action contributes in two ways: (1) indirectly—by educating consciences in Christian principles, and creating thus an atmosphere favourable to their moral realization, that atmosphere without which all laws and institutions, even if they remain in existence, become mere vain exterior apparatus and scene-painting; (2) directly—by promoting and assisting all the organizations and enterprises that set out to apply Christian principles to politico-social life."

In the matter of education the Holy Father has always stressed the fact that the first and immediate apostles of working-men must themselves be working-men. But for England that cannot mean the formation of anything like Catholic Trade Unions—in *Quadragesimo Anno* Pius XI extended to all countries the provisions of *Singulari quadam* on the safeguards required for those who belong to neutral unions. We cannot contemplate a mass movement of Catholics in this country, but must work by penetration and infiltration. And this carries with it the necessary corollary that they who penetrate, that they who infiltrate, must be trained. Here again it seems impossible for us to visualize anything like a mass movement in the near future. We at least have the Catholic Workers' College at Oxford, and the invaluable work which is being done throughout the country by the Catholic Social Guild. But their concern is to train an *élite*—those who are willing to go back to school. Theirs' to be the leaven in the three measures of meal.

Over and above this there is needed some more universal, more national, means of influencing the vast number of those who will perhaps never make contact with the *élite*. We need a means of creating the atmosphere favourable to the moral realization of Christian principles. The twofold message of Love of God and Justice and Charity to Neighbour must be made to penetrate to every man in the kingdom. In other words, we must advertise our goods; and use the world's means to do this. Immediately we say this we realize what it implies, for never more than at present were there

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

cheap books, cheap papers, cheap pamphlets, and all of them finding readers. This year we have seen in what high regard the Holy Father holds the Catholic Press; and in fact the Vatican Press Exhibition is but the culmination of the recognition by all the recent Popes of the importance of a good Press "as a very efficacious method of apostolate and as a chief function of Catholic Action" (Civardi). The present Pope has called the Press "that great means of propagating thought and ideas" and has explicitly asserted that the good Press is one of the most important functions of Catholic Action. As we are concerned here with the Press only in so far as it is directed to the Christian-wise reorientation of society, we must see that a Catholic paper dealing with the Social Question, and that in a popular form and at a popular price, is a veritable necessity in this country.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER.

A beginning has been made: twelve months ago, in June, the first issue of *The Catholic Worker* appeared. It would be advisable perhaps to sketch briefly the genesis of this paper, and thereby dispel any false notions which may be abroad. In the first place due acknowledgment and thanks must be paid to the energetic and vital editors of the New York *Catholic Worker*, but for whose inspiration and example the present achievement might be as yet unborn.

On May Day, 1933, a few Catholics in New York, led by Miss Dorothy Day (an ex-Communist journalist), began a venture of faith. They brought out 2,500 copies of a paper called *The Catholic Worker—and sold them all*.⁸ News of this spread to England and copies of the paper were eagerly read by Catholics who felt that the time had come for a similar move in this country.⁹ By January of 1935 a small group had been formed to thresh out the many questions which had to be settled before publishing. But all were agreed on one point: a paper was to be published and that as soon as possible. At Easter a number of the students who had taken their Diplomas at the Catholic Workers' College gave their

⁸ Cf. *The Month*, October, 1934, p. 344.

⁹ It is worthy of note that, inspired by the work in New York, there are now *Catholic Workers* in Canada, India and Australia.

adherence, which was particularly welcome as it ensured sound doctrine which would not be doctrinaire. From among them an Editor was appointed, and (as it was proposed to print the paper in Manchester) His Lordship the Bishop of Salford was approached. He gave his wholehearted approval and appointed a priest to act as censor. On the back page of each copy of the paper each month there will be found two very significant sentences: (1) *Cum permissu Superiorum*—a sign of the orthodoxy of what is contained in the paper; (2) *Printed by . . . (T.U.—44-hour week)*. This is very necessary, for it would be unthinkable for a paper which is so insistent on the necessity of Trade Unions to be printed by a non-Union firm.

In June last, the first copy of the paper appeared, and met with a mixed reception. There were, and still are, the usual group of reactionaries who regard the paper as Socialist;¹⁰ there were those who (unaware of the ecclesiastical censorship) feared for the continued orthodoxy of the paper unless properly controlled; and there were those to whom the paper came as water after a long drought. It was for these that the paper was founded, and it is they who are supporting it. The many working-class Catholics whom the paper is now reaching are beginning to realize some of the sublimity, of the reality, practicality, depth and actuality of the Church's social teaching. With regard to ecclesiastical authority: before the end of July the Editor had received letters of approval and blessing from almost the whole of the Hierarchy. Since that time its circulation has grown slowly but steadily, and it is our firm belief that we are still a long way off saturation point.

After a year of existence it is well to stand back and examine what influence it has, or what influence it hopes to have. First, a general note: it has power of penetration. The writer knows of many cases of men who have long since lapsed from their duties but who take the paper regularly and read it with interest. Who knows but that for some of them it may be the only occasion

¹⁰ One is tempted to remind such people of the remark of Leo XIII to someone who had told him that his social teaching was Socialism: "Je ne sais pas si, pour vous, c'est du socialisme. Pour moi, c'est du pur christianisme."

of grace which they will have for many a year to come? Copies left lying round, in public vehicles, in workshops, even (be it whispered) in Catholic club-rooms, will *penetrate*. The paper will arouse interest, it is *designed* to arouse interest, in those who hitherto have heard but little of the Papal teaching on labour. In particular, it has two offices to perform, the one positive, the other negative. The Catholic Press as a whole is necessary to counteract moral evil, to oppose evil with good. Similarly the *Worker* is necessary to counteract the social heresies which in these days under various forms are deceiving many. That is its negative work. But it has a very definite positive mission too: the formation of a social conscience. It always stresses "Justice before Charity," it provides and explains principles, often in the light of present-day affairs. A criticism which might be made, with some justification too, is that the paper until now has been a little too much obsessed by the here-and-now Parliamentary fluctuations. This is the fault of trying to overdo the idea of actuality, which for Catholics must always mean primarily: true spirituality. But this has not been forgotten, for a determined effort is being made by the paper to foster the liturgical spirit. The reason for urging the claims of the Liturgy in a paper devoted to the Social Question¹¹ may be stated thus: in his encyclical *Caritate Christi Compulsi* the Holy Father called for prayer and penance as being the chief need "in the present distress of the human race." In other documents, encyclicals, etc., he has said that the Liturgy is the most perfect form of prayer. Therefore is the *Catholic Worker* justified in making its twin interests: Liturgy and Sociology. Each month the paper has on several pages a short translation of some parts of the Masses which will occur during the month. These are chosen to show the actuality of the prayer of the Church, as also to entice readers to *pray* the Mass. This in fact is the main object of the liturgical spirit of the paper: to increase the number of those *actively* present at Mass as distinct from those who are passively present. Thus several columns are devoted each month to an explanation

¹¹ Cf. for an expansion of these ideas: "The Outside of the Cup," in *CLERGY REVIEW*, May, 1936; and "Liturgy and Sociology" in *Blackfriars*, April, 1935.

of the Mass, a simple analysis of almost every word which is said in the Ordinary.

Before concluding this short outline of the position of *The Catholic Worker* it must be stressed that all the work done in connection with it is entirely voluntary. The initial sum required to found the paper was given by a kind friend, the editing, sub-editing and articles are all done gratis; and finally the distribution is also cared for by voluntary workers. And if the circulation is to increase these workers must be doubled, and trebled. They are usually very hard to find, but in several parishes when the clergy have interested themselves in the promotion of sales voluntary distributors have always been found, and sales firmly established. At the beginning of the article it was said that we cannot contemplate a mass movement of Catholics in this country, yet *The Catholic Worker* in time will come to provide just those links which are needed. Listen to Lenin on the subject:

I continue to insist that we can start establishing real contacts only with the aid of a common newspaper, which will summarize the results of the diverse forms of activity and thereby stimulate our people to march forward untiringly along all the innumerable roads which lead to revolution in the same way as all lead to Rome. The mere function of distributing a newspaper will help to establish real contacts . . . the rôle of a newspaper does not limit itself only to the propagating of ideas . . . a newspaper is not only the collective propagandist and agitator, but also the collective organizer.

CATHOLIC YOUTH.

"Further, the needs of the day require that the clergy and the laity should create new forms of Christian apostolate in accordance with changes of custom and habits" (Pius XI). One of the most interesting phenomena of post-War Europe has been the growth and extension of youth organizations, such as (on a racial basis) the *Hitlerjugend* and the Italian *balilla*. In many countries Catholics have not been slow to keep pace with these changes of customs and habits and have formed their own organizations, the most outstanding of which are undoubtedly the various branches of A.C.J.B. (*Action Catholique Jeunesse Belge*) and A.C.J.F. (*Action Catholique Jeunesse Française*), and in particular the workers' section, the J.O.C. (*Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne*).

There is a feeling among many Catholics that such a movement is needed here, for it is certainly true that we have at present *no* Catholic youth organization (national in scope) which will satisfy the requirements of Catholic Action strictly so called. We have put forward as the aim of Social Action: to create a social conscience, and for this we surely need compact and educated groups of young Catholics. Last year the J.O.C. celebrated the tenth anniversary of its foundation and was the recipient of great papal commendation. Early in the year Cardinal Pacelli wrote in the name of the Pope to Canon Cardyn, its founder, in these terms:

The J.O.C. is, in the eyes of the Sovereign Pontiff, a perfect type of that Catholic Action which is one of the chief thoughts of his pontificate. In subordination to the Hierarchy, it provides for the spiritual conquest of the Young Worker; and its organization and methods are exactly adapted to a design which, to gain souls to our Lord Jesus Christ the more easily, aims at Christianizing working conditions. In this way it corresponds to the thought expressed by His Holiness Pius XI in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: "The first apostles of the working men must themselves be workers."

There may be those who will appreciate the need for some new organization for the "formation" of Catholic youth, but who will refuse to consider the J.O.C. as being "all very well for the Continent, but it won't do over here!" To these we recall the words of the Holy Father himself, writing to Cardinal Van Roey, at the time of the congress held to celebrate the "Jocist" anniversary:

It has grown, not only in Belgium where it has strengthened Catholicism and drawn to it many new adherents; and it has crossed your frontiers. So one can assuredly hope that it will spread even further in the future, adapting itself to local circumstances, conforming itself to the wishes of the Bishops.

And he goes on to say that it could not be otherwise considering that it is an authentic form of Catholic Action.

The Catholic Worker has realized that if some adapted form of the J.O.C. is ever to become a *fait accompli* in this country there are several prerequisites. First the work which the J.O.C. is doing abroad must be brought

home to the English reader, and this is done by frequent notes on the activities of the Young Catholic workers of Belgium and France. Secondly, some attempt must be made to adapt their system to English conditions. This may need some explanation. The J.O.C. method is that of "integral formation," i.e., between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, the young worker who joins the J.O.C. gives himself over to it to be "formed." The formation is religious, moral, social, and apostolic, and his every act must be done "jocistically." We cannot hope for anything quite so thoroughgoing as this in England, but there must be hundreds of Catholic youths who are otherwise untouched by Catholic organizations, but who would be eager and willing to give their adherence to a movement which would equip them for their position as apostles. "The J.O.C. is the mission of the workers to the workers . . . the motto of the J.O.C. is: 'Amongst themselves, by themselves, for themselves.' The young workers must learn to see, judge and act. That is, to see the working conditions and social evils in their own surroundings; to judge the validity of any scheme by having a knowledge of Catholic social teaching on the one hand, and of the remedies proposed by different political and social bodies on the other; to act by living a Christian social life, among themselves, and by advocating their doctrine as the true solution of modern evils."¹²

HOUSES OF HOSPITALITY.

"But there is room for action in the temporal order by the application of gospel principles to material circumstances,"¹³ and "artificial propaganda is worse than useless; for propaganda can only inspire conviction when it has genuine faith and enthusiasm behind it."¹⁴ We realize that the old maxim: *verba movent, exempla trahunt* has lost none of its force, and that it is essential that we do something. We can effect nothing—yet—in the political order, and so are left with the seven

¹² *Christian Democrat*, May, 1935. A full account of the J.O.C. will be found in the articles by Fr. B. Salt in *The Sower* for April-June, July-September, 1933.

¹³ *CLERGY REVIEW*, April, 1936, p. 302.

¹⁴ Dawson, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

corporal works of mercy. The New York *Catholic Worker* came to this conclusion some time ago and founded a "House of Hospitality" which is just what the words signify: a house where there will be food, clothing and shelter for the needy. Similar work is being done in Toronto by the Baroness de Hueck, and has proved itself both by the support which is given to it and by the ever-present need for expansion. Already preliminary preparation has been undertaken in a town in England in which *The Catholic Worker* is firmly established, and which though not on the official list of Distressed Areas is almost as hard-hit as any of them. It would be impossible to detail all that is hoped from this new venture, but perhaps a skeleton outline will suffice:

The primary purpose of the "House" will be the formation of a Catholic social conscience in a particular area.

This will be achieved by means of:

I. PRACTICAL CHARITY.

- (a) By the provision of meals.
- (b) By the provision of clothing.
- (c) By the provision of shelter (where desirable).

II. INQUIRY OFFICE (dealing with questions on):

- (a) Transitional payments, Unemployment and Health Insurance Benefits.
- (b) Public Assistance, Pensions and Rent cases.
- (c) Help in finding suitable employment, lodgings, etc. (In short, anything and everything that comes along.)

III. EDUCATION AND PROPAGANDA.

- (a) Library.
- (b) Lectures and Debates.
- (c) Study Circles.
- (d) Educational visits and the distribution of literature.

It is hoped that it will be a centre of Catholic Social Action where practice will mingle with theory, where the principles which are enunciated will be *lived*. While not wishing to claim for the pioneers more than their due, do they not bear some faint resemblance to those men "who will boldly declare for Christian principles of justice and charity and truth, and who will conquer by love," whom M. Maritain envisages as starting the Christian Revolution? More could be written on this

matter, but as the House has not yet been opened it would perhaps be a little premature.¹⁵

CONCLUSION.

Our first thought, in conclusion, must be a realization that we definitely have at our disposal the means of forming a strong Catholic social *bloc*—if the reader will forgive the Jocist terminology. The work of the Catholic Social Guild must be extended and supplemented; extended by founding more groups for the discussion of matters connected with the Social Question; supplemented by (may we hope?) some nation-wide organization of Catholic youth so that it plays a real part in moulding the future of this country. Cardinal Mercier was wont to say that society had apostatized; it is for this generation and the next to win it back. But there is one error which it is, and will be, none too easy to avoid. In their enthusiasm to sweep away all the abuses of the Capitalist system and to look for a "New Deal" all round, some Catholics may appear to be, and indeed may become, very "left-wing," even left-wing politically. This must not be. The work of Catholic Social Action is supra-political: on this the teaching of the Holy See has always been explicit and clear. Thus Catholic Social Action must not appear to ally itself with any party, be it Labour, National Conservative, National Labour, or merely National. Perhaps the best description of the policy, and politics, of Catholic Social Action would be: Papal. The Popes, Leo, Benedict, Pius X and Pius XI have all expounded the principles necessary for the stability of family life, for the reconstruction of the social order, for the Christianization of society. It remains for us to absorb them, and then to put them into practice.

"Let then all those who, under the pastors of the Church, wish to fight this good and peaceful fight of Christ, as far as talents, powers and station allow, strive to play their part in the Christian reconstruction of human society which Leo XIII inaugurated in his immortal encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. Let them seek,

¹⁵ For further information we would beg the reader to consult the June issue of the *Catholic Worker* (p. 4) and also subsequent numbers as they appear.

not themselves and the things that are their own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's. Let them not urge their own ideas with undue persistence, but be ready to abandon them, however admirable, should the greater common good seem to require it: that in all and above all Christ may reign and rule, to Whom be honour and glory and power for ever and ever."¹⁶

¹⁶ *Quadragesimo Anno*, §147.

THE ENGLISH MARTYRS AND ENGLISH CRIMINAL LAW¹

BY THE REV. H. W. R. LILLIE, S.J., M.A.

MUCH has already been written about the English Martyrs, but the subject seems inexhaustible. In the following pages an attempt is made to treat the subject from a point of view that seems so far to have attracted little attention from Catholic writers. We propose to examine the Trials of the Martyrs in relation to English Criminal Law. By so doing we may be able to give some answers to the important questions that are frequently asked nowadays such as: Were the Martyrs traitors? Were they treated fairly? Was the justice meted out to them any different from that afforded to the ordinary political prisoners of the time? What would be the verdict of an unbiassed English lawyer on these trials?

The present article is only a rough delineation, but perhaps it may stimulate those who are learned in the law to produce a volume of permanent value which will be both a contribution to the history of English Law and a help to the better appreciation of our Martyrs.

Treason is the oldest and worst of crimes known to English law; worst, because it strikes at the existence of the State; oldest, because it is the first real crime in our history. About the year 890 in a codification of already existing laws made by Alfred the Great we find it stated that "almost for every misdeed a money compensation might be exacted 'except in the case of treason against a lord; to which they dared not assign

¹ The writer is much indebted to the Rev. C. A. Newdigate, S.J., and to Mr. Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., for their kindness in helping towards the preparation of this article. Also to Mr. S. G. Vesey FitzGerald very special thanks are due for his painstaking and valuable criticism. Nevertheless, for the opinions expressed in the ensuing pages the responsibility rests on the writer alone.

any mercy.' ”² Treason is therefore the oldest Common Law crime and the first crime to be punishable by death and not by payment. From early times we can distinguish High Treason and Petit Treason. High Treason was the homicide of the king. Petit Treason was the homicide of any lord other than the king, e.g., the wife killing her husband or the priest his bishop. Petit Treason received statutory definition by the Statute of Treasons of 1351, and as such did not drop out of our history until 1828. By the same statute of 1351 the crime of High Treason also received definition. It declared to be High Treason seven offences all of which are forms of attack on the persons of the king or of his immediate representatives. These offences are as follows :—

- (i.) Levying war against the king in his realm.
- (ii.) Compassing or imagining the death of the king, or that of his wife, or of their eldest son and heir.
- (iii.) Violating the Queen-Consort, or the wife of the Heir-apparent, or the king's eldest unmarried daughter.
- (iv.) Counterfeiting the Great Seal or the Privy Seal.³
- (v.) Adhering to the king's enemies anywhere.
- (vi.) False-moneying.⁴
- (vii.) Killing the Chancellor, Treasurer, or any other of the king's justices in the exercise of their duties.

In the time of Henry VIII new principles began to enter into the Law of Treason for two reasons—the need of safeguarding the Royal Supremacy over the Church and the desire to protect an uncertain succession to the throne. It was made treason to deny the Royal Supremacy⁵ or the validity of the king's marriage with

² Stubbs' *Charters*, Ninth Edition, p. 70.

³ Reduced to an ordinary felony by the Forgery Act of 1861.

⁴ Now ranks as the offence of coining. Cf. Stephens, *Hist. Crim. Law*, IV, p. 134 n.

⁵ 26 Henry VIII, i.

Anne Boleyn.⁶ Henry VIII's treason legislation abandoned any logical connection with the principle embodied in the Statute of Treason of 1351. It stressed not so much the attack on the Sovereign but the heinousness of the offence. Hence by various statutes such offences as wilful poisoning, assembling riotously to the number of twelve and not dispersing upon proclamation, clipping money and so forth were at this period declared to be Treason; and in 1534 Treason became chargeable in word⁷ as well as in deed.

This immense development in statutory Treason under Henry VIII was afterwards successively modified to suit the special circumstances of Elizabeth's reign. The Government, determined upon the extermination of the Catholic religion, gradually brought all Catholic activities under the head of Treason. As Henry VIII had conceived it necessary to protect the Royal Supremacy and the Succession by new Treason legislation, so now the Elizabethan Government believed that nothing less than further Treason laws would enable the work of the Reformation to survive. Thus, under the Tudors Treason no longer connoted an attack on the person of the Sovereign, but any activity—religious or otherwise—which the Sovereign or his ministers chose to regard as opposed to the welfare of the State or in any other way objectionable. The Law of Treason from being a merely personal and protective law had now become an efficient instrument not only for the purpose of state-defence, but for the imposing of the royal will on the mass of the nation.

Treason was punished by an especially savage procedure, the sentence at one time including the drawing of the traitor on a hurdle at the horse's tail to the place of execution, hanging followed by disembowelling while still alive, and the burning of his entrails before his face. The Treason Act of 1814 abolished this barbarism but sanctioned bodily mutilation after death. Now the sentence is that the offender shall be hanged by the neck until dead unless the king by special warrant substitutes

⁶ 25 Henry VIII, xxii.

⁷ Manifested by an overt act. It was decided by all the judges in Pine's case (1629) that words without an overt act were not treason.

death by decapitation.⁸ Although counsel for defence was not allowed the prisoner, the judge was expected to look after his interests if the need arose. And by the statutes of 1547 and 1551 it was enacted that the charge of Treason must be maintained by at least two witnesses.⁹ Another advantage the prisoner possessed was the right of "peremptory challenge." This meant that when the Petty Jury was impanelled for his trial he could except against any member of it up to the number of thirty-five without giving his reasons for doing so. The prosecution could also challenge, but only "for cause," i.e., they had to lay before the court the grounds of their challenge. Apart from these small privileges, on the whole, criminal procedure in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was heavily in favour of the Crown, and in practice the accused gained little advantage from the few favours allowed him by the law.

The Tudor Treason legislation contains the bulk of what we know as the Penal Laws. These laws resemble a process of strangulation. In the reign of Henry VIII circumstances were less difficult for the Catholic because the king professed himself a member of the Church, save in so far as Papal Supremacy was concerned. But, even so, legislation was effective enough to catch many distinguished men in its toils. Anyone was liable to serious penalties who, when officially asked, refused to abjure the ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Pope. But from 1559 onwards the net was drawn more tight and sure. Quite apart from the lesser penalties of fines, imprisonment and forfeitures, the charge of Treason dogged with a terrible persistence the steps of any English-born priest who was ordained abroad and who came to England.¹⁰ Neither he nor any one at all might bring into the country Papal Bulls or Letters or maintain that the Queen was a heretic or a schismatic.¹¹ He might not

⁸ Cf. Stephen's *Commentaries*, IV, p. 145, Fifteenth Edition (1908).

⁹ It was a matter of dispute later whether or not these statutes were repealed by 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 10. Not until 1696 was the necessity of two witnesses finally settled by statute.

¹⁰ 27 Eliz., c. 2.

¹¹ 13 Eliz., c. 1.

convert anyone.¹² The very fact of his Continental education was one of the worst of crimes.¹³ If he was seen saying Mass it was taken as a sign of his having been ordained by the authority of Rome. If he preached, his words, if overheard, were imputed as an attempt to pervert the Queen's subjects from their natural obedience. If he were caught in disguise he could be held to have resorted to a subterfuge which clearly showed treasonous intentions contrary to any of the laws his enemies wished to act upon. This state of affairs reached its full development in 1585, the year in which the most drastic of the Penal statutes became law. As from that year the very existence of a Catholic priest in England was High Treason, and the Catholic religion was to all appearances doomed.

There are about six hundred English Martyrs all told.¹⁴ Henry VIII accounted for about fifty of them.¹⁵ The rest perished during the reign of Elizabeth and onwards up to the year 1681. Not all of the six hundred were brought up for trial, nor did all survive to suffer at the hands of the executioner. Of many of them we know very little; of some barely more than their names. The records that have come down to us are often extremely scanty and frequently mention nothing that would interest the student of criminal prosecutions; and, owing to the imperfect system of reporting in vogue during the sixteenth century, a large proportion of the existing material is rendered unintelligible and bewildering. But, fortunately, in not a few cases—especially with regard to the later processes—fairly accurate reports are to be had; but even these, as they are frequently the work of enemies of the Faith, need cautious treatment. There have also been preserved narratives written by Catholics who were either present at the trials or who appear to have had easy access to the facts. These records, too, have to be carefully weighed in order to discount the

¹² 23 Eliz., c. 1.

¹³ 27 Eliz., c. 2.

¹⁴ This enumeration includes all those who suffered death for the Faith, irrespective of any declaration of the Holy See as to their sanctity.

¹⁵ This number does not include those who suffered for their share in the Pilgrimage of Grace.

inevitable bias of a fellow-sufferer. Generally speaking, personal accounts of the martyrs themselves are to be trusted, for they bear not only the stamp of genuinity and sincerity but they show a marked moderation which dispels any suspicion of fraud or dishonesty.

Despite these limitations we can form a tolerably accurate idea of the general standard of justice of the day. Hardly ever were trials "fair" in our sense of the word. State prosecutions were very different things from what they are to-day. Now, we consider it essential for condemnation that the prisoner should be proved guilty in the most convincing manner possible. Any loophole or weakness in the evidence is allowed to tell in the prisoner's favour. Indeed, we regard the whole process rather from the prisoner's point of view than from that of the State. We say with Sir John Fortescue¹⁶ that it is better for twenty guilty men to escape than that one innocent man should be condemned. But in the sixteenth century a criminal prosecution was regarded in an entirely different light. The State was in danger; therefore, in doubt, the benefit must be given to the State whose safety was far more important than were the rights of the individual.¹⁷ Such a policy is, of course, the outcome of fear, and it illustrates well the feeling prevalent since the days when the Tudors rescued the country from the anarchy of the Wars of the Roses that, whatever happened, nothing must endanger the position of the Sovereign. Any movement, whether religious, social or political, which threatened to subvert the policy of the Crown must be ruthlessly suppressed. This explains not only the autocratic policy of the Tudors, but also to some extent the light in which Catholicism came to be regarded. If the king chose to desert the

¹⁶ Lord Chief Justice, and later Lord Chancellor under Henry VI.

¹⁷ This is well expressed by Stephen (*Hist. Crim. Law*, I, 395 et seq.): "Nowadays a prisoner is regarded as innocent till proved guilty. This was not the old attitude. If the Grand Jury returned a 'True Bill,' a man was half, or more than half, proved to be an enemy of the king, and in the struggle between the king and the suspected man, all advantages were to be secured to the king whose safety is far more important to the public than the life of such a questionable person as the prisoner."

Catholic Faith, then, for the sake of protecting the Head of the State, the Catholic Faith must be put entirely out of the way. In consequence, under the Tudors and even under the Stuarts, the Law became one of the most efficacious means of getting rid of obnoxious people. A State prosecution for Treason seldom failed of its purpose. No prisoner—nobleman or commoner, Catholic or Protestant—had much chance of an acquittal. When once the law got hold of a man it was usually a warning to prepare for the worst. Religious Trials apart, during the sixteenth century in the whole range of Treason trials, there appear to be no more than two known instances of political prisoners being acquitted.¹⁸ One of these occurred in the reign of Henry VIII;¹⁹ the other was the famous case of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton in 1554. Throckmorton, who was an exceptionally able and energetic man, managed by an extraordinary display of nerve and adroitness to impress the jury so favourably that they refused, in spite of the bullying and combination of the Crown lawyers, to bring in the required verdict. Throckmorton got off; but the jury were punished by being committed to prison. Four of them were discharged after humbly admitting that they had done wrong. Three of the others were adjudged to pay £3,000 each and the remaining five £200 each.

It might be thought that if escape was so difficult for an able man like Throckmorton, who was almost certainly guilty, it would be much easier in the case of the martyrs who were innocent. But, in fact, this was not so. Whether they were guilty or innocent made no difference. Most of them were quite unskilled in the law and the practice of the courts. They were often ill, and appeared in court after suffering the severest pains which torture could inflict. They were confined until the day of trial. They rarely had adequate knowledge of the charge that was to be preferred against them, and none at all of the evidence that was being prepared to support it. They were not allowed counsel to advise them as to their defence, or to see their witnesses (if they could procure, or were allowed any) and put their evidence in order. The judge, whose duty it was to act

¹⁸ Cf. Howell's *State Trials*, I, 467, Ed. 1810.

¹⁹ The trial of Lord Dacres in 1535.

as counsel for the prisoner, frequently showed himself hostile and flagrantly aggressive. Instead of being calmly called upon by the court for his defence when the case for the prosecution was closed, the prisoner from the beginning to the end of the trial was literally baited with questions and accusations by court and counsel and repeatedly urged by both to confess his guilt. Most men though entirely innocent were under such circumstances utterly unable to defend themselves.²⁰ Thus the martyrs were harassed by every mode of attack, being constrained to withstand singly the ingenuity and zeal of eminent advocates enforcing charges which it was out of their power to controvert.²¹ Juries were rarely a protection to the prisoner; even if not packed, they were prejudiced and hostile. It is hard to conceive that amid such difficulties anybody at all could be acquitted.

It is no matter for surprise that many of the martyrs could make no headway against obstacles of this kind. A large number took their trial in a spirit of resignation and pleaded guilty. The readiness with which some confessed frequently took the court by surprise, and left the judge and prosecution obviously disappointed at the loss of the opportunity of making the prisoner the object of their insults.

But not all the martyrs behaved in this way. Sir Thomas More, who had previously held the highest judicial post in the realm, was not slow to make the most of legal flaws or of the contradictions or falsities of the witnesses.²² Many—but by no means all—of the Jesuits showed no desire to be condemned without making a fight for it. They, as well as others, in a number of cases proved themselves the equals of the best lawyers of the day, although they had had no legal training and were constrained to rely solely on their own alertness and natural wit.²³ By far the most brilliant

²⁰ Forsyth, *History of Trial by Jury*, 395.

²¹ Reeves, *Hist. Eng. Law*, V, 234.

²² Cf. Howell's *State Trials*, I, 386.

²³ The trials of the following martyrs who had previously studied law are especially interesting: Bd. John Storey (1571), Bd. Henry Walpole (1595), Bd. John Roberts (1610), Bd. William Scott (1612), Bd. Henry Morse (1645), Bd. Philip Powel (1646), Bd. Richard Langhorn (1679), Bd. David Lewis (1679). Cf. also the trial of Bd. Thomas More (1535).

of these examples is the trial of Bd. Edmund Campion and his companions. Campion, who had been severely racked and who came into court ill and weak, undertook to defend not only himself but also all his fellow-prisoners. This he did with an energy and skill which commanded the admiration of all. He gave the Crown lawyers, who were the ablest advocates of the day, no quarter, intercepting and parrying their remarks with amazing subtlety. Campion never let a point pass; showed the contradictions in their witnesses, exposed the weakness of their arguments with an ease that would have secured him a clear acquittal from an impartial jury.²⁴ A trial of hardly less interest is that of Bd. William Howard, Viscount Stafford, in 1681. Stafford was an old man, but he defended himself with considerable skill for seven days.

Let us now look at the details of the actual process of a State prosecution. After the prisoner was apprehended and committed to prison, he was brought before the Grand Jury at the next Assizes. The Grand Jury was a body of twenty-four men selected by the Sheriff from the body of the county of whom twenty-three were chosen to consider whether or not there was a *prima facie* case against the prisoner. On the appointed day the prisoner was brought to the bar there to listen to the Bill of Indictment, i.e., a document containing the charges against him, which was read before the whole court assembled. This formality concluded, the indictment was handed over to the Grand Jury who retired to consult upon it. If they considered that there was a *prima facie* case, they returned the indictment to the judge endorsed "Billa Vera" (or "True Bill"); if they found no case, they returned it endorsed "Ignoramus" ("We do not know"). If no *prima facie* case had been found, the prisoner was either discharged, or, what was more likely in the sixteenth century, remanded until such time as there could be got together a Grand Jury which would return a "True Bill." But if a "True Bill" had been returned, he was either committed to prison to await his trial, or his trial might take place immediately—as apparently happened in the case of

²⁴ Cf. Howell's *State Trials*, I, 1049; and the account in Simpson's *Campion*.

Bd. David Lewis, S.J., at Monmouth, in 1679. At this arraignment a curious irregularity occurred. Father Lewis tells us in his account²⁵ that the prosecution challenged two of the Grand Jury on the ground of their possibly befriending the prisoner. It was contrary to legal practice for either prisoner or prosecution to challenge the Grand Jury, although such a challenge was allowed against the Petty Jury—as we have pointed out above. Lewis expresses his surprise that the judge allowed it—the same judge having disallowed such a challenge on a previous occasion saying that it was ridiculous and not usual for the prosecution to challenge the Grand Jury. This inconsistent attitude was apparently due to the influence of one Arnold, a hater of Catholics, who was a kinsman of the judge and who exercised a great influence over him. As will be seen later incidents of this kind were quite common in trials for recusancy.

In the interval between the preliminary arraignment before the Grand Jury and the trial (sometimes even earlier) the prisoner in more important cases was brought before the Privy Council and there submitted to a rigorous examination, some of the examiners being destined to be his prosecutors when the case came on.²⁶ If the prisoner proved intractable, the Council saved themselves the labour of intricate investigation by putting the prisoner to torture. This barbarous practice was a common feature of the criminal procedure of those days. Its purpose was either to get the prisoner to confess his guilt and incriminate others or to force him to make answers out of which the prosecution could draw up their case against him. Everything he said was taken down, in order that it might be brought against him as evidence, pruned or fabricated into such a form as was likely to make most effectively for a conviction. Thus many of the martyrs had their chance of acquittal completely destroyed by the production of answers that they had given or were supposed to have given before the Council—answers that it was usually

²⁵ Cited in Howell's *State Trials*, VII, 250.

²⁶ Examination before the Council was not indispensable nor was it necessarily directly related to procedure in the ordinary courts of the King.

out of their power to controvert except by a plain denial.

The use of torture has given rise to a very interesting legal discussion. There was a very firm tradition dating from the time of Henry VI that caused lawyers to discountenance, if not in deed, at any rate in theory, the application of torture.²⁷ It is said that in the time of Henry VI the rack was introduced into the Tower to provide the Crown with evidence out of the prisoner's own mouth against himself and other people.²⁸ Sir John Fortescue, a well-known legal writer of the fifteenth century, in his "*De Laudibus Legum Anglorum*," cap. 22, strongly asserts that the Common Law knew no such engine of power as the rack. Coke, in his *Institutes*,²⁹ affirms that it was directly against law and cannot be justified by any usage.³⁰ But, of all the lawyers who presided at or countenanced torture, Coke was probably the most notorious.³¹ English lawyers have not failed to notice this discrepancy between Coke's practice and his teaching, one writer describing his behaviour as "nauseous and sordid, highly unbecoming a gentleman of the profession."³²

We may well ask why, if its use was illegal, torture was so extensively employed? An interesting incident in the reign of Charles I supplies the most probable answer. Felton, the assassin of Buckingham was in 1628 examined before the Council. He declared that no man living had incited him to the murder. The Bishop of London (Laud) said to him: "If you will not confess, you must go to the rack." Felton replied with obvious good sense: "If it must be so, I know not whom I may accuse in the extremity of my torture, Bishop Laud

²⁷ Foster, *Crown Law*, 240 et seq. Emlyn in his preface to the second edition of the *State Trials*, published in 1730, says that it is "a practice which Englishmen are happily unacquainted with."

²⁸ Foster, *op. cit.*

²⁹ 3 *Inst.*, 35.

³⁰ Even abroad the absence of torture at our criminal proceedings was noticed and approved by Grotius—*Letters*, no. 693.

³¹ Coke in the Countess of Shrewsbury's case (1612) almost admits its legality.

³² Foster, *op. cit.*, 244.

perhaps or any lord at this Board." The matter ended in a reference to the judges who unanimously resolved that the rack could not be legally used.³³ Rushworth, in his *Collections* relates that the king who was present at the conference of judges, asked them whether by the law he might be racked, or whether there were any law against it; for if it might be done by the law, then he would not "use his prerogative on this point."³⁴ Supposing Rushworth's account to be true,³⁵ we have here a clear indication that the use of torture to extract evidence was not in all circumstances illegal. Although against Common Law the infliction of torture could be legally justified by the sanction of the extraordinary authority of the Crown which could supersede the Common Law in emergencies. The conditions necessary for its legitimate employment are stated by Jardine in his *Reading on the Use of Torture*. He says (p. 67): "It is quite clear that the authority to examine by torture in this country must have always derived IMMEDIATELY and in each particular instance SPECIFICALLY from the prerogative of the Crown. It must be 'by command of the King'; and this command must be signified . . . by the king's own mouth, or by the Council, which is incorporate with him, and speaks with his mouth." No magistrate or judge, and no individual councillor or Secretary of State was at liberty to use the rack or any lesser species of torture without a written warrant from the king himself, or from the Privy Council when assembled at the Board.

What Jardine tells us is sufficient to explain the inconsistency of Coke's behaviour with his expressed opinions. Acting in his younger days as the instrument of the Royal Prerogative he could be present at the most frightful scenes without a scruple. When he was an older man and one of the representatives of the Common Law in its struggle with the Prerogative, he reverted to the common lawyer's standpoint and had no hesitation in reprobating torture in express terms, condemning it on principle and declaring it unlawful.

³³ Foster, op. cit.

³⁴ Rushworth, *Coll.*, I, 650.

³⁵ Gardiner believes it to be correct—*Hist. of E.*, VI, 359, n. 2. Jardine suspects it—*Reading on the Use of Torture*, p. 60-62.

Somehow it is difficult to believe that the right to torture was never abused. For a number of cases, such as those of Sherwin, Briant, Campion, Henry Walpole and Southwell,³⁶ the warrants still exist. But it is certain that Topcliffe and Young received a kind of general permission to torture recusants.³⁷ Although, so far as we are aware, up to the present there has come to light no evidence to prove that torture was ever applied without some kind of general sanction, yet Jardine seems too confident in his assertion that permission must have always derived "IMMEDIATELY and in each particular instance SPECIFICALLY" from Crown or Council, and he is certainly in error when he says that no woman is ever known to have been tortured. Bd. Margaret Ward and Bd. Anne Line were both tortured, in 1588 and 1601 respectively.³⁸ Anyhow, it is clear that in practice the use of torture in the case of the martyrs, at the mere discretion of the Privy Council and uncontrolled by any law save the will of the Sovereign, was frequent. Briant was tormented with needles thrust into his nails, racked and starved for two days and nights, and reduced to such extremities that he ate the clay out of the walls of his prison and drank the droppings of the roof.³⁹ Bd. Nicholas Owen died from the effects of the rack, Bd. Henry Walpole (1598) was tortured fourteen times. Bd. Robert Southwell is reported to have been tortured nineteen times. Coke, who was at the time Attorney-General, told Southwell that it was lawful and pious to make an example of him (the Jesuits were so wicked a race) by inventing a new and unusual mode of torture. When Southwell informed the Court with some warmth of his sufferings, he was stopped by the Lord Chief Justice saying that it was lawful to use such torture. Southwell said that he confessed it to be lawful. Coke then said: "We will

³⁶ All beatified, the last two in 1929, the former three by decrees of Pope Leo XIII in 1886 and 1895.

³⁷ *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, sub voce "Topcliffe." Cf. also Meyer, *England and the Cath. Ch. Under Q. Elizabeth*, 182 note, and 183 note.

³⁸ Foley, *Records of the Eng. Prov. S.J.*, I, 414-415. The number of martyrs who suffered torture totals at least forty.

³⁹ Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*, I, 210.

tear your hearts out of a hundred of your bodies."⁴⁰ Such words as these make us suspect that Catholics probably suffered more at the hands of the rackmaster than even the prerogative actually sanctioned.

Partly because of its prerogative nature, and partly because of its evident barbarity, the employment of torture has never found approval among English lawyers. Fortescue spoke against it in the fifteenth century. Coke condemned it. Sir Thomas Smith, one of Queen Elizabeth's secretaries and a valuable writer on legal procedure, reprobates it. More modern English writers, such as Sir Michael Foster, Jardine and, in our own day, Professor Holdsworth, agree with all humane men in viewing it with horror as having a brutalizing effect upon those who use it and spreading like a disease in a legal system in which it has once become acclimatized.⁴¹

After Torture had given the prosecution matter suited to their taste, they proceeded to draw up their evidence. Working on the material afforded, the documents destined to be presented and read in court were now drafted in the absence of the prisoner who was to be inculpated by them. This dastardly and unjust proceeding was greatly encouraged by the practice just mentioned of exhibiting evidence to the jury only in the form of writing. The Crown lawyers came into court with the written depositions and examinations of the prisoner and then read from them such portions as as had been appointed to be read by those who had drawn them up. These documents may now be seen among the State Papers. We come across such marginal notes as these in the handwriting of Coke himself: "Read A and B only"; "Read not this"; "Cave"; "Hucusque." As Jardine says: "the prisoner was not only subjected to the gross injustice of an accusation made behind his back, but by this skilful pruning of the depositions was effectually precluded from detecting and pointing out to the jury any inconsistencies in the accusations made."⁴² A particularly scandalous instance of this sort of thing

⁴⁰ Foley, op. cit., 362 et seq.

⁴¹ Holdsworth, *Hist. Eng. Law*, V, 194. Cf. also Jardine, *Criminal Trials*, I, Introd. 22; Smith, *De Repub. Angl.*, II, c. 24; Fortescue, *De Laudibus*, c. 27.

⁴² Cf. Jardine, *Criminal Trials*, I, Intro. 27.

occurred in the trial of Garnet. As usual, the evidence consisted of statements made by Garnet before the Commissioners and produced in documentary form by the prosecution. If the whole of Garnet's confession had been read, it would have been far too favourable to Garnet. Consequently by judicious dissection Sir Edward Coke so managed it that the passages read should convey an impression to the jury entirely contrary to the meaning of the document itself.⁴³

Not only in the preparation of evidence but in the drawing up of indictments falsification was practised on a very wide scale. The indictment prepared for the trial of the Bd. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, is a case in point.⁴⁴ The whole document is false everywhere, and the errors are as gross as can be imagined. To take a specimen. There is a section which professes to be an extract from a Bull published by Sixtus V on April 1st, 1588. No one has ever seen or heard of the Bull and the alleged citations from it are palpably translations from passages in one of Cardinal Allen's books. The responsibility for the outrage probably lies with Burghley.⁴⁵

One might think that in the sixteenth century falsification is not to be wondered at; but in the matter of indictments the tradition of the law was even then very strict. Indeed, the precision required in the indictment has always been one of the most salient characteristics of English criminal procedure. Hence it is all the more remarkable that so many gross errors, deliberate and otherwise, should have gone undetected. It tells only too significantly of the anti-Catholic temper of the time. According to the tradition of English Law, for a good

⁴³ The confession with Coke's marginal notes will be found printed in full in Jardine, *op. cit.*, 357. Hardly a better instance of this iniquitous practice can be found.

⁴⁴ The Earl was not actually martyred but died in the Tower in 1595.

⁴⁵ Cath. Record Society, XXI, 220 et seq. Another interesting example of this odious practice is to be found in the indictment of Bd. Thomas Alfield (1585) which is grounded on treasonous statements supposed to be contained in the book of Cardinal Allen, entitled *True, Sincere and Modest Defence*. Compare the passage as it appears in the indictment with the passage as it actually appears in the book—C.R.S., V, 112.

indictment it is required that the name and the condition of the accused must be truly stated, and also the year, day and place of the crime. The offence must be charged with certainty, and similar certainty was needed in stating the act done by the accused and the manner in which he did it. Any defect in the indictment could be taken advantage of by the prisoner before judgment was pronounced.⁴⁶ An interesting example of a martyr making the most of a bad indictment occurs in the case of Bd. John Mason (1591) who was indicted for knowing a seminary priest and not revealing him. He replied that the law gave him three days' space in which to act and he had been arrested before the three days had elapsed. The truth of this statement was so undeniable that the indictment was quashed and another prepared upon which his condemnation was more speciously achieved.⁴⁷ Seven years previously in 1584, Bd. James Fenn also seems to have pleaded falsity in the indictment. The judge told him that though there might be some error in the circumstances of time and place, yet he had been sufficiently convicted of treason. Whereupon to the amazement of the bystanders, he directed the jury to find him guilty on the indictment.⁴⁸

(To be Continued)

⁴⁶ Holdsworth, *Hist. Eng. Law*, III, 614 et seq.

⁴⁷ Pollen, *Acts of the English MM.*, 110.

⁴⁸ Challoner's *Lives*, p. 92, Ed. Pollen. Bd. William Freeman (1595) was indicted as Robert Freeman, but he did not take advantage of the error.

HOMILETICS

BY DOM ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost.

DEATH.

It is appointed unto men once to die (Hebrews ix. 27).

(1) Introductory: Man's mind naturally drawn to think of death at this season of the year.

(2) Death a penalty.

(3) An expiation.

(4) Its inevitability and finality.

(1) At this season of falling leaves and ever encroaching darkness our minds readily dwell on the thought of our own end. Holy Church is ever guided, not only by the Holy Ghost, but likewise by a most unerring sense of the fitness of things. The apparent death of nature is bound to cause even those least given to reflection to think of the inevitable end of this existence and all that follows it. But even as the seeming decay of nature's vitality is but a pause in which she gathers her forces for the annual miracle of spring, so is death not an end, but a beginning.

(2) We are not concerned here with the views of philosophy or physiology concerning the phenomenon of death; we consider it solely from the Christian standpoint. Though death marks the end of our life in this world—and precisely for that very reason—it is the most important moment of our existence. How did this tremendous thing come into the world? In Holy Scripture death is invariably described as a punishment of sin. God expressly declines all responsibility for its coming into our world: *God made not death, neither hath He pleasure in the destruction of the living, for He created all things that they might be* (Wisdom i. 13, 14).

However, by reason of our composite nature, death was a natural possibility from the beginning; only the dread possibility need never have become actuality. The human body is bound by the same laws of wear and tear as those to which other organisms are subject, hence also, to certain though gradual disintegration. The soul does indeed fashion and mould the body in a certain sense, and all the body's vital powers have their source and origin in this purely spiritual element of our being, but it is not the natural and necessary function of the soul to shield the body from the attacks of those forces which sap the foundations of our "house of clay" (Job iv. 19).

This could only be done by man's Creator, and even though His tender mercy is upon all flesh (Eccli. xviii. 12), He was under no obligation to do it. Hence the gift of immortality bestowed upon Adam was not due to him as part of his natural endowment. It was closely linked to the supernatural holiness which was the first man's highest possession. If he should lose the friendship thus established between him and his God, man would also forfeit the gift of immortality that was his: *In what day soever thou shalt eat of it (the forbidden fruit) thou shalt die the death* (Gen. ii. 17). Sin and death are therefore close relations; the one is the inevitable sequel of the other. Just as in Adam all men lost the primeval grace which, in the divine plan, was to be transmitted at the same time as men received their human nature from the fountain-head of the race, so did his sin render them liable to the penalty of death. St. Paul clinches the point in no uncertain fashion: *By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin, death; and so death passed upon all men* (Rom. v. 12).

(3) Death is a punishment. But in this world no penalty inflicted by God is of a purely punitive character. Hence there is a medicinal quality even in that which is apparently but destruction. We may well read such a meaning into the comforting assurance of the author of Wisdom: *He (God) made the nations of the earth for health and there is no poison of destruction in them* (i. 14). From God only *best and perfect gifts proceed* (James i. 17), hence there is "some soul of goodness" even in that which men look upon as the climax of all possible evils. If we bow humbly and lovingly to the will of our Creator, the act of dying may be the most perfect act of worship and love of our whole life. And this act we may make whilst we are in full possession of our powers, for with God there is neither space nor time. Hence we should take time by the forelock and frequently make such acts as will, so to speak, colour the supreme act of our existence with all the submission to, and loving worship of, God's sovereignty which it will then be beyond our power to elicit.

(4) Death is inevitable. Only a lunatic could hope to escape the most universal of all laws. We are all of us seated in the condemned cell. The days, the hours go by beyond recall. We shall never again pass the milestones that mark the road by which we have journeyed. And the last of them all draws nigh. Elementary prudence demands that we should bear it ever in mind. The thought is a solemn, but not necessarily a depressing one, unless we look at death in a wrong perspective. We should not think of it as an end, but rather as a beginning—the beginning of the existence for which we were created.

What for us is the sunset of a perfect day—beautiful yet tinged with melancholy—is the golden dawn of a new day for the people of another hemisphere. To the Christian, to die is to enter into true life, so that for him death is not loss but gain.

The unbeliever fears death as all men fear the unknown. For a Christian that fear exists also, though far less acutely, for even we have no experimental knowledge of the hereafter. However, our faith throws enough light on the dark ocean on whose billows the soul sets out at death, to allay the elemental fear lest we fall into some vast, shapeless void in which our personality would be swallowed up for ever. Nature is even more afraid of ceasing to be than of an existence which might conceivably be not a happy one.

That which for us invests death with its terrors, is the knowledge of its finality: that is, such a fixity of will and character as precludes all change. We shall be for ever what we are at the moment of death. There may be no dogmatic definition on the subject but the thing is so certain that it is simply Catholic teaching which it would be sinful folly to impugn or to deny: *If the tree fall to the south, or to the north, in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be* (Ecces. xi. 3).

St. Benedict enumerates among other means of sanctification that of "keeping death daily before one's eyes" (*Rule*, c. IV). But this fear must not be sheer terror of the unknown. Rather should it be a sense of awe of God's justice and holiness which inflict so dread a penalty for human sin. But whilst we revere God's stern judgment we should see in death the gate of life. If we must first walk through the valley of the great shadow, the path is sure, and the feet of generations have smoothed it. Jesus Himself has trodden it and left luminous footprints behind both for guidance and for encouragement. *Whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Therefore whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's* (Romans xiv. 8).

Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost.

THE PARTICULAR JUDGMENT.

It is appointed unto men once to die and after that the Judgment (Hebrews ix. 27).

- (1) The general judgment at the end of the world.
- (2) The particular judgment at the end of our life.
- (3) The irrevocable sentence, which takes effect at once.

(1) When our Lord had vanished out of sight behind a white cloud on the day on which He left this earth to return whence He had come, angels told the disciples who kept gazing after Him with wonder in their eyes, that He would come back, even as they had seen Him go into heaven. Ever since, Christians have looked forward to the wonderful day when the Son of God would return upon the clouds of heaven to judge the living and the dead. That day is properly "the day of the Lord," and the thought of its awful splendour was present as an

inspiration and a comfort to the human imagination of our Lord as He stood, a condemned man, before His iniquitous judges: *Hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming in the clouds of heaven* (Matthew xxvi. 64).

The world's last day, the day of the final judgment, will be a magnificent assize for all humanity. On that day God will justify the ways of His providence with men, whilst, on the other hand, the good and the evil done by men shall be brought to light. Then shall Christ act as *Judge of the living and the dead* (Acts xi. 42), for on that day the judgments dealt out to every human individual, as well as to every successive human generation during their brief spell upon this planet, will be revealed and finally confirmed.

This universal judgment holds no terror for the elect. For them it is a day to be greatly longed for. St. John heard the loud cries of *them that were slain for the word of God* proceeding from under the altar which he beheld in heaven: *How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?* (Apoc. vi. 9, 10). But the saints do not long for that day from a purely selfish desire for revenge on their enemies. Since they are the friends of Christ and the trophies of His victory, they wish Him to be seen in the glory of His supreme judicature which constitutes part of the reward of His life of poverty and toil and of His death in shame and torment.

As for the date of that tremendous event, neither man nor angel may know it. It is the Judge's own secret; but it will come as the greatest surprise the world has ever experienced: *the day of the Lord shall so come as a thief in the night, for when they shall say peace and security, then shall sudden destruction come upon them* (I Thess. v. 2, 3).

(2) The final judgment may be far off or it may very well be at the door. No man can tell; for God, Who, as the Lenten hymn has it, "is both the King and the Maker of time," uses standards and measures that needs must puzzle and bewilder human imagination. We need not indulge in futile calculations on that score—it is no concern of ours. But the particular examination into our life, and the verdict pronounced upon it, are matters of immediate concern to us. It is certain that the eternal fate of every soul is decided before the last judgment. The words which stand at the head of this paper may refer to the judgment at the end of the world, but an almost universal practice of long standing certainly allows us to look on them as an allusion to the judgment of individual souls as they enter into the mysterious world beyond this present one. But the matter is clinched by Him who, whilst on earth, saw what was going on in that other world. There He saw two men recently dead of whom one was at rest, whilst the other was buried in hell. The fate of these two souls did not remain in suspense;

they passed at once into their respective abodes, and that irrevocably, for between them there *was fixed a great chaos, so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, nor from thence come hither* (Luke xvi. 26). Even in the Old Testament the wise man said that *it is easy before God in the day of death to reward every one according to his ways* (Eccli. xi. 28). All this implies examination, scrutiny, judgment.

Deep mystery shrouds the procedure at this tremendous judgment. We know the names of many who received favourable sentence. They are, to begin with, the canonized Saints, for canonization is the exercise of the unerring teaching magisterium by which the Pope declares that he or she who is thus honoured is among the elect. On the other hand, not of any one man may we say that he was condemned at the bar of the supreme judge. That terrible secret will only be revealed at the last day.

How then may we visualize these awe-inspiring proceedings? Without doubt they are as simple as they are peremptory. The popular notion is that as soon as the soul has left the body, it stands face to face with Christ and that from His lips it hears its sentence. Our Lord is certainly the appointed judge of all men, but the chief act of His supreme judicature of which the New Testament speaks so often will be exercised at the end of the world. We do not know how, or to what extent the Son of God intervenes in the particular judgment. This judgment consists in the soul's consciousness that its fate is sealed by Christ. Viewed in the light of psychology it is probably best to say that the sentence lies in the soul's vision of its condition in the sight of God. What St. Paul says of the Gentiles who knew not the Law, admirably fits the present case: *the Gentiles, says the Apostle, shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men* (Rom. ii. 15, 16).

Whilst it is tied up with the body the soul is not conscious of itself, or, more accurately, it has no direct and experimental evidence of its nature and still less of its condition in the sight of God. In this world we are intensely body-conscious; of the soul we are not immediately aware. Once the soul is parted from the body it enters upon a new mode of existence and action. Henceforth it acts like a pure spirit. Therefore, just as his own essence is the immediate and necessary object of an angel's knowledge, so is the soul aware of its own self and conscious of its moral status. In a flash, at a glance, it takes cognizance of its condition. It beholds at a glance all the good it has done, and the evil it has committed. Above all, and at long last, it knows beyond a doubt whether it is in a state of grace or not. For grace is a dynamic force that propels the soul towards God. Of this powerful impulse the soul can not only be no longer unaware, as is the case now, but with all the impetuosity of an untrammelled spirit it rushes forward towards Him who is its

last end. If, on the contrary, the soul is weighted by the intolerable burden of mortal sin, it falls at once into the fathomless abyss of an everlasting night where it *shall suffer eternal punishment in destruction, from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of His power* (2 Thess. i. 9).

(3) If we picture the soul's particular and secret judgment in this way, it is not difficult to see that it must follow death without any interval. Death is an incident which affects the soul only indirectly. The body alone dies, for it alone is composed of warring elements that eventually bring about its disintegration. But the soul is not stunned into insensibility by the shock of death or bewildered by the new setting in which it finds itself. It is keenly alive, and its activity now fully corresponds to its dynamic power. Hence it is not possible that it should be in any uncertainty either as regards its condition or its final destiny.

This is the judgment we should fear. God is no less just than He is merciful. The reign of mercy is now at an end; henceforth justice deals out both rewards and punishments. But let us be of good heart; our judge is our best friend, and He gave His life for us.

Twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost.

PURGATORY.

It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sins (2 Macch. xii. 45).

(1) What we know of Purgatory: its existence; that souls detained in it are being cleansed; and that the living can help them.

(2) What we do not know about it: its real nature; its duration.

(1) Purgatory is a province of the unseen world which is of immense interest and appeal, but concerning which our information is of the scantiest. Reason itself suggests the appropriateness, not to say the indispensable necessity of a state situate midway between heaven and hell. Few men live such lives as to fit them to pass directly from this distracting world into the splendours of God's own house. Many again, though far from stainless, are nevertheless free from crime. These, surely, a merciful, though most just God, could not allow to perish for ever, or rather precisely because He is just He sees the gold in the roughest block of quartz. Hence the notion of a period or a state of purification for lesser faults, not atoned for here, has always been present to the mind of humanity. However, reason is a very inadequate guide in these mysterious regions. But where mere reason can do no better than strike her poor matches

in an infinite night, faith gives us a sure guidance and even a measure of light.

Two texts, one in the Old and one in the New Testament, have from time immemorial been interpreted as referring to Purgatory. In the second book of Macchabees we read that when some of the soldiers of the Jewish hero had fallen in battle, objects purloined by them from the temples of idols were found on them. Now this was a transgression of the Law. Thereupon the Macchabee caused a sum of money to be sent to the temple with a view to sacrifices being offered, inasmuch as he deemed it a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins. Now even if the book of Macchabees were not an inspired book—which it emphatically is—the passage would still be of great value as proving that at that time at any rate the Jews believed in a state or mode of existence after this life in which imperfect souls could be cleansed, and that the living were able to help them by prayer and good works. The just, of course, were in Abraham's bosom, the wicked in hell. The former needed no help; to the latter it could not avail to any purpose.

The other text is a rather obscure saying of St. Paul in which he compares the lives of men to the work of builders and architects. The work of some is very imperfect, but it will be made perfect "yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 15). The passage is given an eschatological meaning, but there is not sufficient unanimity among the Fathers to enable us to state definitely that St. Paul had in mind what we call Purgatory, still less should it be asserted that the passage is a proof that the pains of that mysterious world are caused by a real, material fire.

(2) Though Purgatory is a world of mystery, it is not altogether impossible to form a rational view of it. Once we grasp the fundamental principle that from the moment of its separation from the body, the soul exists and acts as do all spirits, many obscurities vanish. In the first instant, then, of its separate existence the soul, if perfectly pure and with no obligation to divine justice, flies to its God with the inconceivable impetuosity which charity imparts to it. The first act of the soul in its new state must needs be an act of charity such as it perhaps never made before, that is, an act the dynamic force of which corresponds to and fully exhausts its utmost capacity. In this life so many things prevent the full play of the soul's powers! Now all distractions and hindrances have fallen away as if by enchantment. By grace the soul is even now impelled towards God. Its first act as a spirit disengaged from any link with matter is to allow itself to be swept onward by this divine driving power and to concur with it to the uttermost limit of its energy. By this act all and every venial sin is utterly blotted out, for venial sin is essentially an act which is not so much against the divine scheme of things as one that falls short of the intensity with which we should work for its fulfilment. Hence a perfect

act of charity, that is, one that equals the soul's capacity, corrects every remissness or forgetfulness.

However, even the slightest shortcoming must be atoned for by some kind of penal process, the measure or quality of which God alone determines by a positive decree of His just will. Essentially this pain is the delay of the beatific vision of which the soul is capable and for which it longs with incomprehensible ardour. Such is the impetuosity with which it would rush towards its blissful goal that only a positive intervention of God can frustrate it. As one of those fragments of cosmic matter which, as it cleaves the air becomes heated through friction and flares up and melts away in a blaze of light, so does the soul, chafing, as it were, under the restraint put upon it, get inflamed with burning eagerness and longing for God. This pain is described as the "pain of loss" but in this case obviously the word does not mean the same thing as the pain of loss in hell, for there it is indeed a realization of loss of the Supreme Good, but the realization is accompanied by hatred, whereas the Holy Souls' sense of loss is really the pain of love thwarted of its object, even though only for a time. This pain is unique and beyond our grasp and it is perfectly correct to say that it surpasses any pain we know of, for it is something totally outside our experience.

(3) The temporary privation of the beatific vision is the essential pain of Purgatory, and it is the only one of which we know. All else has been left in obscurity. This does not satisfy human curiosity, which, in this instance, is excusable enough. Books on Purgatory abound with information on a world concerning which both Bible and Church observe so dignified a reticence. When studying this literature let us hold fast to the principle that the souls in Purgatory are *Holy Souls* and pure spirits utterly free from all contact with matter. Hence even if the cause of some of their sufferings has a material origin, the pain can only be felt spiritually: therefore the visions and descriptions given even by canonized Saints are largely, if not wholly, to be interpreted allegorically. In any case let us refrain from making of Purgatory a suburb of hell, which emphatically it is not. Views of Purgatory have been coloured by the spirit of different races and periods. All we know is that there is a state or mode of existence called Purgatory, where holy souls suffer, to atone to divine justice, in a way and for a time fixed by a positive act of God. In this matter psychology is not enough; we must admit a direct and exclusive intervention on the part of God.

But these holy souls can be helped by our prayers and good works, especially by the sacrifice of the Mass. Let that suffice. "There is no doubt," says St. Augustine, "that the dead are aided by the prayers of holy Church, by the saving sacrifice and by the alms which are poured out for their spirits" (Sermo. 172).

Twenty-fifth Sunday after Pentecost.

HELL.

These shall go into everlasting punishment (Matthew xxv. 46).

- (1) Hell the necessary counterpart of heaven.
- (2) Essentially, hell is the loss of God.
- (3) It is an eternal punishment because the will of the reprobate is eternally fixed in wickedness.

(1) The refuse and filth of a ship flow down into the bilge. Hell may be visualized as the sink of the universe where all that is foul, all that is opposed to God, must necessarily and finally collect. Hell is the natural and necessary counterpart of heaven, for God would not be a moral being did He not punish evil even as He rewards good, and here, too, there must be some final stage beyond which there is no further possibility of change. This finality is reached at death.

On the other hand it would be a wholly inadequate conception of heaven and hell if we saw in them little more than either a bribe or a deterrent. Heaven is indeed a reward, the thought of which may well act as an inducement, but it is no mere bribe. It is before all else the possession, by our mind and will, of God, the sovereign truth, and the supreme good. Hell is the loss, wilful as well as irreparable, of that for which we were created. The existence of hell is a terrific fact, and facts have a way of being exceedingly uncomfortable. Against them sentiment is powerless. Modern humanitarianism and spineless sentimentality cause many to shut their eyes to the spectacle of *the smoke of their torments that shall ascend up for ever and ever* (Apoc. xiv. II). Yet Dante, theologian and poet, does not hesitate to ascribe the creation of hell to "sovereign wisdom and primeval love." It might be said also, that some of the people the earth bears just now are enough to make one believe in hell! Unless omnipotent mercy works a miracle greater than the creation of light, there are men on earth so steeped in wickedness as almost to anticipate the *obstination* of the will of the reprobate. If on the subject of Purgatory Holy Scripture is astonishingly reticent, the same cannot be said of hell. Space does not allow of quotation, nor is there need of it. It is enough to say that the notion of punishment in the next world for crimes committed in this is so ingrained in humanity that it forms part of the religion of all peoples and races. This is obviously due to that elementary fund of truth which mankind has never wholly lost, as well as to its innate sense of justice. Men have often enough made unto themselves gods after their own hearts, but they have never been willing to rob the deity of the attribute of morality. To deny hell is tantamount to denying that God is just.

True, God is love; but in Him love and justice and all His other attributes are but so many human conceptions of an incomprehensible nature in which all the qualities or properties are identical with the essence; for, as St. Augustine says in a hundred places, "what God *has*, that He *is*!" Hence it is quite impossible for one of His qualities to be, so to speak, in conflict with another. Love is but another name for unapproachable holiness which cannot connive at evil by feebly condoning it and thereby confusing the opposing issues of right and wrong. As a matter of fact the horror of hell is that, as far as God is concerned, all His actions in regards to the reprobate are manifestations of His goodness, but they, by their own act, have so warped their nature that the very benefits of God turn to their misery, just as a diseased eye suffers from the beneficent rays of the sun which gladden a healthy organ.

(2) Though a number of texts throw light on the nature of the dread abode of Satan and his satellites, a dense mystery broods over the abyss. There are two things which we know definitely: one is that hell is the loss of God; and secondly, that the reprobate are confined for ever in an abode which the Bible alternately describes as a world of darkness and as a pool of fire.

Whatever God *might* have done to satisfy man's craving for happiness, what He actually did was to supernaturalize him by grace and to make of a beatific union with Him the end and purpose of his existence. God is simply Beauty, Joy and Goodness itself, so that to possess Him is to possess the very source of all bliss. Now the reprobate are for ever hopelessly debarred from this object of their very existence, and that through a deliberate act of theirs by which they turned from God, their last end. They have lost *Good* itself, which they could have secured, and for the loss of which no other and lesser good can compensate them. In this life man may get along without God; he may allow himself to be intoxicated by the good things the world offers; but when these things have fallen from him he is only conscious of a great void. Only God could have filled the heart He has made vast enough to receive and hold Him. There are no words to describe the anguish caused by so appalling a loss because we cannot conceive the fierce yearnings, loves and hatreds of a disembodied spirit.

Pœna damni, the pain of loss; *alligatio ad ignem*; bald theological formulas but of dreadful significance. Our souls are made for God; He draws us with an infinite force of attraction. At death our spirit is liberated from matter; at once, through the *momentum* given to it by the power of charity, it is as it were, shot towards Him. If, on the other hand, it is weighted with the load of mortal sin, it falls back, away from the light and warmth of His presence. To be thrown back upon itself, to feed upon itself ("for something else to hack and hew," as Carlyle says in a terrible phrase) in an infinite, dark solitude that is the pain of loss. But besides this there is another

penalty, one that is so searing, so searching, that only the destructive force of fire can convey an idea of its sharpness. Holy Church has been far too wise to make any definite statement as regards the nature of that fire; but Holy Writ speaks with so much emphasis that we cannot take its words in a metaphorical sense as merely standing for the sum total of the miseries of the reprobate. That it is not a fire fed by wood or coal is obvious, but it is a physical energy or force the effects of which are akin to those of fire. We may well leave it at that.

It may be asked how can fire, a material thing, hurt pure spirits such as the devils are, or the disembodied spirits of the reprobate, or, after the resurrection, their bodies, without also destroying them? The answer is that this fire must be thought of as a kind of dungeon in which these spirits are confined. By nature a spirit is free and untrammelled; this fire has power to hold it and to check its activity. Thus the spirit driven in upon itself: *I am tormented in this flame*, said one whom the eye of Jesus saw in its prison of fire. (Luke xvi. 24).

(3) Hell lasts for ever. *Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels* (Matt. xxv. 41). Hell endures eternally simply because the will of the reprobate is fixed in sin. It is against the nature of a spirit to alter a decision once taken. The reprobate ratify, by an unchanging act, and with the fulness of their powers of mind and will, the choice by which they turned from God, their last end. They cannot repent; not because God could not give them grace, but because He respects the creatures of His hands and deals with them in accordance with the laws of their being, and to go back on a decision once made is against these laws.

On the other hand, we should refrain from ingenious images and comparisons by which to give an idea of an infinite vista of millions of ages succeeding each other. Here there is no perspective of a future; hell is simply an unchanging, actual misery which should not be thought of according to our categories of space and time.

It is good to lean over the brink of the abyss: to visit in spirit that world of everlasting horror—there will be little fear then of our ever going there in reality. If we hearken to our Lord's invitation: *Come unto Me, all!* we shall never hear that appalling sentence of His: *Depart from Me!* Who can bear the thought of being cast off by Jesus? And whither must they go whom He spurns? *Into everlasting fire!* A fire that yields no light; into the everlasting night which lies like a funereal pall over the abode of those who are dead for ever (Lamentations iii. 6); which envelops eternally the unhappy beings whose mind will never be illumined by everlasting truth, for they are, in Dante's noble phrase

*anime maledette
che hanno perduto il ben' del intelletto.*

First Sunday of Advent.

HEAVEN.

I believe to see the good things of the Lord in the land of the living (Ps. xxvi. 13).

- (1) Man's longing for happiness :
 - (a) universal ;
 - (b) never satisfied in this world.
- (2) Perfect happiness consists in goodness, viz. :
 - (a) the knowledge of truth ;
 - (b) the love of good ;
 - (c) this is only found in God.
- (3) Other joys of heaven.

(1) One of the oldest images of human life on earth is the wide, restless ocean. As we contemplate the broad expanse of water, that which strikes us most is its ceaseless motion. From the day when the Creator gathered the sea in its immense basin, a mysterious force has been stirring the mighty deep : day and night the waters are driven shoreward and again they recoil upon themselves.

Even as the ocean has its moods, its ebb and flow, so is the heart of man never long in the same disposition. We are for ever yearning for peace, stability, happiness, only to see our fondest hopes frustrated. Like a will-o'-the-wisp, happiness flickers before our eyes now here, now there. We pursue it with fiercest and most relentless energy, but when we fancy we have it at last within our grip, we discover that we have only grasped the vacant air.

Yet the longing for happiness is so deeply embedded in every human breast that it must surely be part of our very nature. It is the cry, the hunger and thirst of our inmost being ; hence it was surely grafted on it by the author of our nature. Now it is utterly incompatible with the wisdom of God to be the author of a desire both so eager and so universal, and yet to doom it to everlasting frustration. There is nothing futile in the work of a wise man, says St. Thomas ; how much less then in the work of uncreated Wisdom !

Experience shows that none of the good things of this world, whether taken singly or collectively, can truly satisfy the soul's hunger and thirst. Our soul is evidently so vast that the wide universe itself is unable to fill it. In the last resort the object of our hunger and thirst is God Himself. Not that most men are conscious of any such hunger and thirst, though they are hungry for happiness. The cause of this hunger is in that we are God's creatures. There is in us a kind of sympathy or affinity with Him by reason of which we respond to the infinite attraction which the Creator has for His rational creatures.

(2) Our spirit can only find rest in the knowledge and love of God; the more perfect that knowledge the greater its happiness. The present life precludes perfect happiness, for whilst we are in this world our knowledge of God is restricted and imperfect. The keenest intelligence can make no more than guesses at what God really is, by contemplating His works, whilst the highest ecstasy of the Saint and mystic takes him no further than the vestibule of infinite Beauty. The beauty of the universe is but the shadow of God, and who would say that he knows a man because he has seen the shadow that goes before him?

True, *the heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth his works* (Ps. xviii. 1). Their voices resound from one end of the universe to the other; but how many listen to their message or understand it? For the children of men are dull of heart. God writes His name in shining letters upon the blackboard of the midnight sky; every bush in a hedgerow is aflame with His presence—but not all are sufficiently illumined to take off their shoes to worship the Majesty of His presence. Even faith, hope, and charity, though they establish a bond of union with God, do not give experimental knowledge of Him. Yet this is the ultimate destiny of man raised by grace to a supernatural and wholly divine plane of existence; *We see now through a glass in a dark manner but then, face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known* (1 Cor. xiii. 12).

This is the *beatific vision*, and that which makes heaven what it is. It goes without saying that when we speak of vision, we must exclude the notion of any bodily vision, for God is a spirit whom the eye of the body cannot behold. But sight is the noblest of our senses and it conveys such certainty that when we wish to state that we have grasped a thing we say: *I see*, not with the eye of the body, but with that of the soul. Furthermore, when we look at an object, that object impresses itself on the organ of vision in such wise that the object seen as it were penetrates into our very mind. The trees and flowers we gaze at, do not enter into our eye, and thence into our mind, in their gross material nature, but some subtle image of them penetrates into these faculties and by them we behold or know the things themselves.

Now God is an infinite being whom no image could truly represent. So God Himself flows into our soul, Himself actuating or rousing our faculty of spiritual intuition. *Thus are we filled unto all the fulness of God* (Eph. iii. 19). It is impossible to go into further technicalities, but by this *vision* of God, which is really an *experience* of infinite Beauty and Good, we become, in a certain manner, one with Him. Hence, only hereafter, in the splendour of heaven, shall we be truly sons of God; then shall we be like unto Him, *because we shall see Him as He is* (1 Jo. iii. 2). A special supernatural reinforcement of our intellect will so strengthen the eye of the soul as to enable it to fix an unflinching gaze upon the unveiled splendours of the Sun

of Justice, for that glorious illumination is a partaking of the light in which God Himself dwells: *in thy light we shall see light* (Ps. xxxv. 10).

Seeing God we shall know the archetype of all things; we shall be at rest. There will be nothing to ask, nothing to desire, because we shall know Truth, possess Good and see Beauty itself: "There we shall be at rest and shall see; we shall behold and love, we shall love and praise. Lo! this is what shall be in the end, without end. For what other end is there for us but to arrive at the Kingdom of which there is no end?" (St. Aug. de Civ. Dei, sub fine).

(3) Though the vision of God is the essence of heaven, that experience is so unique that it does not interfere with the free play of the faculties of an immortal and glorified human personality. It is futile, not to say childish, to try to visualize a world of which we have no experience and which even the inspired writers almost exclusively describe in terms that are obviously metaphorical. Suffice it to say that the resurrection of the body implies identity and continuity of distinct personalities. Nevertheless, the bodies of the elect, whilst remaining true human bodies, will yet be so transfigured as to make them meet partners of souls that are plunged into the very depths of the deity. Christ in the glory of His resurrection, or in the splendour of Thabor, is the model after which omnipotent love will transform this body of our lowliness. Let us leave it at that. Surely we can trust God: *I know whom I have believed, and I am certain that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him. against that day* (2 Tim. i. 12).

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE VERY REV. CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.

Père E. Mersch's excellent study in positive theology, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*, now appears in its second edition,¹ with a few corrections in matters of detail and with numerous and valuable additions. These concern chiefly the doctrine of the mystical body as it is presented by each of the evangelists, and also St. Paul's application of the doctrine to the resurrection of the body and the divine life of grace. Many additions have been made to the bibliography to bring it up to date, while the index to the whole work has been doubled in length and very much improved. The first edition of the work was reviewed in these notes shortly after its appearance,² and to what was said there we shall add only that no theologian can afford to neglect this valuable contribution to the study of a vital dogma.

From the Angelicum come two more important theological texts. Fr. Pollet, O.P., edits the first volume of the theological works of Cajetan, containing the *De Comparatione Auctoritatis Papae et Concilii* together with the *Apologia de Comparata Auctoritate Papae et Concilii*.³ Though occasioned by a Gallican controversy of the fifteenth century which is now only of historical importance, the work of the eminent Thomist retains all its value as a theological vindication of Papal authority, and this critical edition, well and clearly printed, will be of the greatest use to theologians of the present day—the more so as the exigencies of modern controversy are turning their minds more and more in the direction of fundamentals.

Another fascicle, edited by H. D. Simonin, O.P., and G. Meersseman, O.P., gives us interesting extracts from Dominican theologians of the thirteenth century concerning the much debated question of the causality of the sacraments⁴. The English reader will perhaps be especially interested in the opinions of the Oxford Dominicans, Richard Fishacre and Robert Kilwardby, though from a theological point of view there is little to be said in their favour, that of Robert Kilwardby in particular reminding us vaguely of the teaching of some of the Lutheran theologians. The development of the views of St. Thomas on this subject is clearly displayed in the extracts here put before us, and once more we are puzzled to find that the Angelic Doctor, contrary to his usual custom, changes his mind without mentioning explicitly that he has done so. There is no doubt that in his earlier works he maintains that the sacraments are the causes, not of grace, but of a disposition

¹ Two volumes. pp. xliii. + 551; 498. 90 francs. Edition Universelle, S.A., 53, Rue Royale, Brussels.

² See CLERGY REVIEW, VI, pp. 56-57.

³ Angelicum, Rome. 1935. pp. 351. 18 lire.

⁴ *De Sacramentorum Efficientia apud Theologos Ord. Praed.* Fasc. I, 1229-1276. Angelicum, Rome. pp. ix. + 133. 14 lire.

preliminary to grace (either the character, or *aliquis ornatus animae*). This was the view current in the schools, and labelled by modern theologians as that of "physical dispositive causality." In the *Summa theologiae* and in *De veritate*, however, he teaches that the sacraments cause grace perfectly. The editors of these extracts offer an explanation which throws an interesting light upon the problem. The change in the view of St. Thomas does not appear so disconcerting when we consider that every instrument, strictly speaking, is a dispositive cause in the sense that it acts dispositively: "Causa instrumentalis non participat actionem causae superioris nisi in quantum per aliquid sibi proprium dispositive operatur ad effectum principalis agentis."⁵ In this sense, therefore, only the principal cause can be called perfective, inasmuch as it alone acts perfectly. According to the editors of this fascicle, St. Thomas "Lombardum exponens, sententiam propriam modeste connectit opinioni tunc vigenti de sacramentorum causalitate dispositiva. . . . Postea, valore et momento propriae doctrinae melius perpensis, pristinam terminologiam necnon praefatam distinctionem procul dubio relinquit, sobrie et limpidè asserens ipsam gratiam a Deo quidem esse ut a causa principali, a sacramentis vero ut ab instrumentis" (p viii.).

In giving us his excellent English version of Origen's *De Principiis*,⁶ Dr. Butterworth has based his translation on the text of the *First Principles* published in 1913 by Dr. Paul Koetschau. Dr. Koetschau contrived to make up for the many deficiencies of Rufinus's translation by embodying in the text the extracts from Origen's work made by Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus in their *Philocalia* and by Justinian in his letter to Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople. He utilized also the fifteen anathemas of the Second Council of Constantinople against Origen, as well as minor fragments found in other writings of the Fathers. Although Dr. Koetschau's conclusions are not universally admitted, his reconstruction may be said to be the nearest we have so far to a faithful presentation of Origen's original work. Dr. Butterworth's introduction is scholarly and interesting, though he perhaps allows his obvious sympathy for Origen and Rufinus to bias his judgment of St. Jerome. He accuses the latter of cowardice in dissociating himself from certain doctrines of Origen at the instigation of Epiphanius. "To us," he writes, "Jerome appears to have shown extreme timidity in the face of an accusation which was not directed against him personally and which he could easily have rebutted. We must remember, on the other hand, that a charge of heresy, if substantiated, was then becoming a serious matter for any man of prominence in the Church, involving perhaps loss of liberty, or even of life itself. Jerome, too, was a Latin, and had little sympathy with the Greek habit of

⁵ *Sum. theol.*, I, q. xlv., art. 5.

⁶ *Origen on First Principles*, by G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. pp. xlii. + 342. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

thinking out problems. Anyway, it is certain that, in spite of all he had previously written in Origen's praise, he determined that for the future he would say or do nothing to compromise himself" (pp. xi.-xii.). That Jerome's intellectual outlook differed from that of the Greeks generally, and especially from that of Origen, may well be admitted; it is equally true, as Dr. Butterworth remarks in another context (p. xxiii.), that "his one anxiety is to clear himself from any suspicion of heresy." But it seems unnecessary to attribute his orthodoxy to any fear of imprisonment or death. Is it not conceivable that, in common with the rest of Christians, he saw in communion with the See of Peter his bounden duty as a Catholic and his one hope of eternal salvation?

In a reprint from the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*⁷ Fr. A. W. Burridge, of the White Fathers, makes a very useful contribution to the history of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It has long been established that the feast of the Conception of our Lady was observed in this country in the eleventh century, and there are clear indications that the feast existed in English calendars before the Norman conquest. But little or no attention has hitherto been paid to the origin and development of the doctrine that underlies the feast, so far as it can be traced in the English writers of the period. Of particular importance in this connection are a letter of Osbert of Clare, written in 1127 or 1128 to St. Anselm, in which he describes and urges the diffusion of the feast of the Conception and also adds theological reasons for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception itself; and above all, the *Tractatus de conceptione sanctae Mariae* of Eadmer, for whom the author vindicates the title of "the earliest writer to treat of the Immaculate Conception."

Those who are now finding the expensive *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* beyond their modest means, need not on that account forego the advantage of reading Père Garrigou-Lagrange's excellent articles, *Prédestination*, *Prémotion*, *Providence*; for their contents have now been embodied by the learned author in a book of some four hundred pages, published by Desclée de Brouwer at 20 francs, under the title *La Prédestination des Saints et La Grâce*. This brilliant exposition of a most difficult subject is beyond praise. The first part of the book expounds the teaching of Scripture on predestination, states the difficulties of the problem to which it gives rise, and classifies the various theological systems which have endeavoured to solve it. Then follows, in the second part, a masterly review of the solutions suggested, concluding with the Thomistic synthesis. The third, and last part deals with the intricate problem of efficacious grace. One may venture to say that the problem of Predestination has never been so clearly stated, nor the Thomistic solution of it so attractively pro-

⁷ *L'Immaculée Conception dans la Théologie de l'Angleterre Médiévale*. Louvain. 1936.

posed, as in this monumental work of the learned Dominican.

Fr. Gerster a Zeil, O.M.C., continues to produce his series of dogmatic treatises *juxta sensum S. Bonaventurae*. His volume on Purgatory has already been reviewed in these Notes.⁸ He has now published two more volumes, one on Hell, the other on Extreme Unction.⁹ They are very concise, yet closely packed with sound theology, and marked especially by their adherence to conservative and traditional views. Each thesis is treated in two sections; in the first we are given the common teaching of theologians, together with the traditional theological proofs, while the second section contains the teaching of St. Bonaventura, given in the form of extracts from his works.

Fr. John Kearney, C.S.Sp., has written an excellent little book entitled *The Meaning of the Mass*.¹⁰ It is perhaps primarily devotional, but the author's exhortations that the faithful should understand the part which they play in the offering of the Mass are based so clearly upon the theology of Sacrifice, that Fr. Kearney's work may well be regarded as a very practical contribution to dogmatic theology. The writer insists especially upon the interior offering of which sacrifice is but the external sign. The "soul" of Christ's sacrifice is His spirit of submission, His perpetual will to offer Himself to the Eternal Father; and the faithful understand the meaning of the Mass and fully appropriate its fruits, only if they identify themselves with the interior dispositions of Christ, their High Priest.

II. PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Fr. Lindworsky's little book, *The Psychology of Asceticism*,¹ might very well be reviewed as a contribution to ascetic theology, but as it is the work of a professional psychologist and is conceived as a problem in applied psychology, it demands attention here. The aim of the book is "to give some hints and suggestions culled from the domain of modern psychological knowledge by way of a contribution to the problem of ascetical training."

The author indicates the concept of Christian asceticism as "the endeavour towards the attainment of Christian perfection" which "in turn is the best fulfilment of the Divine Will." This endeavour has commonly been directed according to the "piece-meal" plan of the acquisition of individual virtues, one after another, without further ordering; but Fr. Lindworsky, sceptical of the doctrine of habits and leaning to the "whole-

⁸ See CLERGY REVIEW, V, p. 312.

⁹ *Infernus* . . . P. T. Villanova Gerster a Zeil. Marietti, Turin. pp. 175. 7 lire. *Sacramentum Extremae Unctionis* . . . pp. 76. 4 lire.

¹⁰ Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. ix. + 192. 5s.

¹ By Johannes Lindworsky, S.J. Translated by Emil A. Heiring. Published by H. W. Edwards, 4, Cecil Court, London, W.C.2. pp. 95. 5s.

theory," inculcates the law of form, with the "formed-aim" in place of this arbitrariness.

This form which gives a new unity to the endeavour is found in "vocation." The Christian must always imitate Christ, and "the Heavenly Father gave His own Son a particular vocation, and even a name indicative of this call." The redeemer-vocation as lived by our Lord can be resolved into "countless nuances and shapes" one of which must always be found in every member of the *corpus mysticum* as his particular vocation-ideal.

Fr. Lindworsky finds the means to the determination of this ideal in the book of the Spiritual Exercises. Once found, this vocation must be regarded as a gift from God and as such it will lead to union with God. Thus a life fully developed, and directed to a recognized goal, achieves stability and serenity and sweeps forward under the impulse of the love of God.

This integration of the empiric rules of ascetic theology, and more particularly of the Ignatian teaching, according to psychological form is of itself interesting and valuable; but much more novelty and practical aid are to be found in the details of the author's plan. In dealing with scruples as anxiety reactions he marks the point at which the aid of the neurologist must be invoked, and he warns his readers against "all popular publications on the subject (of psycho-analysis) without any exception, even if they are from the pens of Catholic writers." He is concerned about hygiene, particularly the hygiene of diet: "One certainly ought not to induce scrupulosity about health in candidates for the priesthood and religious orders. In addition to having a doctor for cases of sickness, however, directors of ecclesiastical colleges should engage the service of an expert in hygiene. . . . Actually, even those who have heard little about proper dietetics will ask themselves in astonishment, especially where local custom calls for a well-loaded table: Is it really the task of monasteries to produce diabetics and other cases of serious metabolic derangement? And the spirit of modern hygienic nourishment would harmonize so well with the spirit of self-control and mortification." Much as one may sympathize with what the author has to say on this subject I cannot but think that his excursus on the health of the apostles (p. 65) is somewhat out of place in a "meditation."

I have devoted so much space to this very small book because I think that it is an excellent example of applied psychology, and that practically it is of first-rate importance for priests and directors. It is a pity that it is so dear. The translation is very readable and, on the whole, excellent.

A much larger book on Psychology at a slightly higher price is not nearly so well worth the money. It is *Psychology in Questions and Answers* by the Rev. Hilarion Duerk, O.F.M.² I gravely doubt whether any presentation of the subject in this form could achieve success; but Fr. Duerk's book has not even

² Published by P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York. pp. xxv. and 230. \$1.50.

the virtues of the catechetical form. As an aid to the nurses who had the benefit of Fr. Duerk's lectures it may have been useful for recapitulation, and it does give a wide survey of psychology both "static" and "dynamic," but I cannot conceive that it could be of much value to an independent student.

Another philosophical manual from America is in quite a different class. *Reality and Mind: Epistemology*³ gives a very clear statement of the scholastic position on the usual lines. The author rejects the "mitigated dogmatism" of Cardinal Mercier in favour of "critical dogmatism," which postulates the three primary truths: "The First Fact, our existence; the First Principle, the Principle of Contradiction; and the First Condition, the essential capability of the mind to know truth." He takes cognizance of Neo-realism, Critical Realism and Objective Realism, and his brief but clear exposition of these and similar modern developments should prove very useful to the student.

Every chapter carries a final synopsis and indicates courses of reading in which the previous English Catholic works on the subject, notably Dr. Vance's, Dr. Coffey's and Fr. Rickaby's, figure largely. Besides a large bibliography and excellent index, there is a valuable glossary of definitions. The book is handsomely produced and it should prove a useful addition to our text-books and a very acceptable introduction to the subject for the general reader.

*The Psychology of St. Thomas Aquinas*⁴ is yet another welcome evidence of the re-awakening of interest in Thomistic studies among our Anglican friends. Much industry and devotion has gone to its compilation. The declared thesis is "that the Psychology of St. Thomas enables us to give a reasonable account of Divine revelation as adapted for Man." Part I deals with the soul, its creation, its state of original justice, its union with the body, its faculties; Part II with knowledge human and divine, and particularly with the knowledge of Christ; Part III with the appetitive faculties. Each part contains chapters of a more theological character, such as those on Kenotism, St. Thomas's refutation of heresies on the Incarnation, the Resurrection. We may hope that this book will direct more of those who are outside the scholastic tradition to a study of the Angelic Doctor and that thus they may be drawn to such appreciation of the Mystical Body and of the elements of Catholic doctrine as is manifested by the present author. If the book runs to a second edition attention should be given to some glaring misprints, which are found more especially in quotations from the original language, and to certain inaccuracies of expression such as those which seem to attribute a priority of time to the soul in its union with the body.

³ By Celestine M. Bittle, O.M.Cap. The Bruce Publishing Company New York; and Geo. E. J. Coldwell, London. pp. x. and 390. 10s.

⁴ By the Rev. W. B. Monahan, M.A., B.D. pp. viii. and 304. To be obtained from the author at St. Swithun's Rectory, Worcester, post free, 10s. 10d.

Every chapter of Bishop Henson's book⁵ is a delight to read for the perfection of its expression and the rich and logical development of its theme. The central argument runs to the effect that Christian morality which is "natural, developing and final" is "the true practical expression of natural theology." The Bishop is at great pains to show that this subject is within the scope of the Gifford foundation: natural theology is the formulation of natural religion, and this expresses itself in a congruous morality.

It is at once manifest that the lecturer's conception of natural theology differs from that current amongst us. Preoccupied with the implication of the term "natural religion" he seems ill at ease under the limitation of "natural theology." But Lord Gifford's own words as quoted on pp. 21 and 24 not only clearly set out the "material and formal objects" of natural theology, but seem to absolve the Bishop of any need for a lengthy apology.

Bishop Henson writes, not as a philosopher or scientist, but "as a professed exponent of religion, perforce a moralist and by choice a student of history." Thus he undertakes an historical survey of morality, by which he means the behaviour of men in society, and comes to the conclusion that Christian morality is the "norm of ethics which, consciously or unconsciously, men must needs accept as they advance in civilization, the standard by which civilized men will finally judge the religions which claim their acceptance."

Insistent as he is on the lapses of human behaviour among Christians in the past, sternly condemnatory of the divergence between the morality corresponding to the Christian faith and the actual practice of its most exalted exponents and professors, acutely aware of the aberrations increasingly evident in "Christian" society to-day, he might have been expected to hesitate over the application of such a criterion to Christian religion. Holiness indeed is a mark of the Church; but that is hardly the same thing. Let it be granted, however, that it is Christian morality natural, developing, and final, which is under review, rather than the application of that morality as a test of the true religion.

Moreover, in the opening words of the second lecture the author corrects any impression of fitting a creed to a current morality, for he tells us that Christian morality is "the morality inculcated by Jesus Christ, and illustrated by His example. It is the morality implicit in the Christian discipleship, and properly required by the religious profession. Finally, it is the morality which historically has had its roots in the Christian religion, has been enjoined by the Christian Church, and has given distinctive character to the civilization of Christendom."

⁵ *Christian Morality, Natural, Developing, Final*. Being the Gifford Lectures, 1935-1936. By Herbert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

In the chapter on Christian Morality in History the impact of revelation on the law of nature is recognized, and the fulfilment of the natural by the divine positive law is clearly suggested.

Throughout, it is in the developing character of Christian morality that the inherent weakness of the argument is most evident. Time and again one is tempted to label the whole scheme as evolutionary ethics, but always a saving sentence prevents us from passing a judgment which would be unjust to the author; and, indeed, the whole of the contention of the finality of Christian morality is against it. But the Bishop is aware of the conflict of opinion in very serious matters of ethics, and his dislike of traditional asceticism and rigidity of ecclesiastical discipline, his sympathy with the obnoxious Fifteenth Resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, his apparent lack of a clear theory of the relation between Church and State, make it necessary for him to admit a development hard to square with that finality which comes from the teaching of Christ and the authoritative injunctions of the Church. There is much in the book that will be of service to Christian thought, notably in the author's defence of the authenticity of the Christian record and his proclamation of the superiority of Christian morality to any rival system and of its independence of pagan sources, but there is also much, as in the facile discounting of St. John's Gospel, which provokes Catholic criticism and even resentment.

III. MODERN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. S. J. GOSLING.

These notes are written round a very short list of new books. No doubt there is a seasonal explanation of that. I am not, however, grieving about the scantiness since it enables me to comment more fully on the idea that lies at the back of most of them, the conflict between the Church and the world which in our day has been stripped of all diplomatic euphemisms and racial disguises and stands out in its stark reality. For this purpose Mr. J. B. Morton's *The Bastille Falls*¹ provides me with a starting point and an historical background.

To our grandfathers the very mention of the Bastille conjured up memories of terror. It stood for the old order; when it fell something new came into the world which challenged the forces of law and order, of the Church and the State, which appealed to the arbitrament of force, but not the force of kings and barons and the ordered discipline of soldiers. The mob realized the power of mere numbers. It is no wonder that for a hundred years and more the memory of the French Revolution lay on the consciousness of Europe like a remembered nightmare. As the industrial age got under way and the standard of living got higher and higher the commercial magnates found a means of enslaving their workpeople much more effective and much less

¹ Longmans. 12s. 6d.

obtrusive than that employed by their feudal predecessors. So gradually the Reign of Terror came to the later Victorians to mean just a bad dream, so that they wondered how civilized men and women could have behaved as they did; almost they came to disbelieve the story. Thus our fathers thought; but we have learned differently. Nowadays we breakfast on horrors compared with which the excesses of a Paris mob sound like the story of a market brawl. Mr. Morton has timed his study of the French Revolution opportunely. We can read it more understandingly for there is nothing like personal experience to quicken our comprehension and stimulate our interest. We at least can see that the French Revolution was not the isolated episode that we were taught to consider it. Modern revolt is the direct successor of the Revolution; the same high-sounding phrases have heralded it, the same ideals have given it inspiration, the same horrors accompany it intensified beyond belief as war has been intensified by the inventions of a hundred years of scientific progress. The affinity between the new revolt and the old is shown to us Catholics most clearly in its insensate fury against religion and the Church. If we confess that too often the policy of ecclesiastics has provided reasons for the attacks on the Church we need not fear a charge of disloyalty; indeed, we should be disloyal to the Church's teaching if we tried to burke the question. We cannot defend the Church by defending all the actions of all her members, be they never so highly placed. With policies, national alliances and racial traditions pulling this way and that it is next to impossible for human wisdom to map a course and keep to it. And though we have the Divine Promise it still remains an obligation to acknowledge that guidance and to co-operate with it; nations as well as individuals have fallen away in the past and will fall away in the future, and we are not called upon to formulate a policy but to listen to a message. It is difficult enough to interpret events in terms of human wisdom; it is dangerous to do so *sub specie aeternitatis*. Yet we may hazard the thought that God has spared His Church the peril of herself initiating a new régime. It may be that events have done that for her. The old order that is passing away began when Constantine freed the early Church and laid the foundations of a diarchy which has, despite occasional loss of balance, persisted to our day. But the end is in sight. Where is the modern State that welcomes unreservedly the co-operation of the Church? The totalitarian State has no place for the Church in its hierarchy. Bolshevism is openly antagonistic because it has to be since its philosophy is rankly materialistic. But the political thought that now inspires the governments of Italy and Germany is no less inimical to the freedom of religious faith. The day of the State Church has gone; whether it will ever return, who can tell? Dr. Adolf Keller in a recent work has written: "The real choice with which the churches are confronted to-day is that between disestablishment and a system of co-operation with the State." We can see, all too clearly, what the latter alternative means,

a lick-spittle subservience which will destroy all respect and make an end quick and unhonoured. For all practical purposes the European churches are already disestablished. In this country the name remains and little else. The State remembers the Established Church to use its clergymen as additional civil servants and its services when it needs public or private pageantry, weddings, funerals, civic pomposities of one kind or another. A good-humoured and slightly bored tolerance is the State's attitude towards the Established Church in this land.

The Catholic Church in England is in the happy position that she has no tradition of establishment; she stands on her own feet, her sole support the free and independent gift of the members of her own communion. This habit of self-reliance which carries with it a distrust, born of experience, of party politics should stand her in good stead in the days before us. Continental Catholics look, naturally enough, to some party in the State for support; that has been their tradition—at least, so it seems to me and I find support for my opinion in *Night Over the East*. There is the temptation to find in certain parties, in certain nations, the *anima naturaliter Catholica* and to identify it with essential Christianity. Let me quote a passage from this book.

"... the sadness that one finds in all the cities of heretics and heathens, for wherever God's children are kept away from His Church they fall into brooding dejection and bear the stamp of melancholy on their foreheads. In Tel-Aviv or Salt Lake City, in Aberdeen or Geneva, in Amsterdam, Moscow or Debreczin, a different spirit reigns from that of Vienna, Lisieux, Paris, Mariazell and Rome. This is evident in the Midlands of England most particularly, where once Oliver Cromwell and his Puritan army sang the Psalms of David through their noses, and where to-day coal-mines, potteries, blast-furnaces and Quaker houses of prayer flourish, for a joyless monotony hangs over the whole of that fogged and sooty country."

What it says is not necessarily untrue but it leads us down dangerous paths ending in the confusion of racial bickerings and *tu quoque* arguments easily manufactured. Speaking of sadness, for instance, what is sadder than the poetry of Ireland? Or meaner and uglier than the mining districts round Lille? Do we seriously want to defend the cruelty of Catholic Italy, the ignorance, often amounting to superstition, of Catholic Spain, the political corruption of Tammany Hall? Or, to put it another way, is the gaiety of Paris and Vienna due to the nearness of the people to God's Church? I for one should doubt that explanation.

I can remember the time when a perusal of such horrors as are recounted in *Night Over the East*² would have produced in me nothing more than a bored incredulity. But we have changed all that: Russia and Mexico, Germany and Spain, have shown the world just what modern civilized men can do, not merely in a sudden frenzy of homicidal passion, but coldly and deliberately with due process of law. There must be some

² Translated by Edwin and Willa Muir. Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

unquiet graves where lie those nineteenth-century Liberals who heralded with such unction in resounding perorations the democratic millennium broadbased upon a nation's will. How to account for this almost universal failure of democracy to live up to the ideals of its sponsors? In this book we have a hint of the answer; it is to be found in the clash of nations and dynasties and the fight of the Catholic Church against the powers of darkness, against murder, sodomy, injustice and oppression, or, "translated directly into their modern equivalents, Cheka, *cinéma vivant*, Wall Street and Macedonia." No matter how you translate them we are here face to face with the great forces of evil; their power is terrifying, so terrifying that we are tempted to seek alliances if the Church is to continue. "All these will I give you if bowing down you will adore me." And the little men, the timid ones, take the bait, weave their policies and become entangled in them, raging furiously at the aloof silence of the saints and leaders of the Church of God who seem, to them, to be unaware of the dangers that surround them and oblivious of the rôle the Church must play in world affairs. Yet her course is set, laid down by her Divine Founder: "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore and Him only shalt thou serve." It sounds like detachment carried to extremes, a fatalistic acceptance of defeat, but it is the only answer vouchsafed to us.

In this supreme conflict, always going on but which has its moments of more intense activity one of which we are now experiencing, it is impossible, blinded with blood and sweat and the dust of the arena, to distinguish friend from foe. Only when the dust has settled on old controversies have we a chance of seeing which way the battle went and perhaps of learning something from its ebb and flow. Hence the never-fading interest in the French Revolution and the eagerness with which every new study of this human tragedy is welcomed. The facts are known, but they are for the most part so bizarre, so bloody, so animated with a sort of perverted heroism that what we want to know are the motives, the springs of action, the emotional stresses that led human beings to these inhuman acts. Mr. Morton can make us see the connection between these apparent incongruities. Particularly is this the case in his treatment of the strange story of Charlotte Corday. I do not remember ever to have read an account of this episode which made the life of Charlotte Corday so intelligible and at the same time left the reader so free to form his own judgments. This may sound as though Mr. Morton had attained heights of inhuman and icy detachment. But it is not so: he has achieved his purpose by combining high dramatic power with intense reticence in expression.

These two books should be read consecutively, Mr. Morton's first and then *Night Over the East*, for they can be made to supplement each other by supplying the nexus which can illustrate the ideology behind both movements.

Father Owen Dudley is concerned with the same problem—as

indeed in these days who is not?—the emergence of an overt and militant atheism. "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." I remember the late Fr. Joseph Rickaby thus commenting on the text: "Not so much 'there is no God,' as 'No God' in the same way that people say 'No Popery.'" They are not affirming that there is no Pope, because there is; but that they will not have him: 'No Pope!', 'No God!'" This blind, hysterical, unreasoning hatred of God is the theme of Fr. Dudley's novel, *The Coming of the Monster*.³ Fr. Dudley has inherited the literary properties of the late Robert Hugh Benson, a hot-house sort of mysticism and a cast of characters belonging to "the best people." If he has also succeeded to Benson's public I am afraid he does not treat them with the same respect, for there is a deal of careless writing in this book, ranging from the threadbare trick of the spaced sentences and isolated phrases to depict emotion to mere superfluous padding. I never came across so much wasteful cigarette-smoking; people are constantly lighting cigarettes and almost immediately "crushing them out" again. It is evident that the author does not visualize the actions he is describing. That is a matter of minor importance, but it is serious when it comes to describing characters. In spite of Fr. Dudley's evident fondness for him I cannot bring myself to think that the "Masterful Monk" is a successful creation. A priest is a most difficult subject for a work of fiction unless cast for a minor part or as an unadmirable character. The reason is that he cannot be natural; his life, his work, his influence and his motives are supernatural; it follows that to describe his actions in terms of the natural man is to depict an unnatural priest. There is one other point I would like to put to Fr. Dudley. He says in his preface: "To sophisticates, cynics and modernists, my interpretation of these events will be dismissed as too contemptibly silly." I think he is probably right, but I also think it a pity that he is content to be. After all, sophistication, cynicism and modernism are the major evils of the day; why encourage the cynics and the modernists in their conceit? Fr. Dudley seems to have resigned himself to the easier task of preaching to the converted.

Mr. Christopher Sykes' *Wassmuss*⁴ suffers from the fact that the author adds the explanatory sub-title: "The Persian Lawrence." It immediately suggests a comparison and in no particular, not in the author, nor the hero, nor the book, can the challenge be sustained. Lawrence was a genius, wayward and may be vain, but a scholar, a poet and a dreamer of dreams. There is no indication in this book that Wassmuss was anything more than a good German intent on making things awkward for the English among the Persian tribes. Mr. Sykes tells us that Wassmuss came to love Persia. That may have been so, but he did not love the Persians and the Persian cause as Lawrence loved the Arabs and sacrificed everything to re-

³ Longmans. 7s. 6d.

⁴ Longmans. 10s. 6d.

establish an Arab sovereignty. That was the difference between the two men; Lawrence, for all that he was an English colonel, fought the English in the council chamber with a courage and tenacity quite as great as he showed in fighting the Turks with guns in Palestine. If Wassmuss indeed loved Persia he despised the Persians for he raved against them, he lied to them and he fooled them. Such conduct is hard to reconcile with any degree of devotion. But it is in estimating the book itself that the mention of Lawrence has its most devastating effect. The "Seven Pillars of Wisdom" has a certain spiritual quality which, even when it irritates and, as in my own case, occasionally repels, is undeniably present and makes it a classic. In comparison Mr. Sykes' book is pedestrian—and halting at that. Mr. Sykes has a schoolboy *penchant* for archaic constructions which, when he indulges it, gives an almost comic effect to passages evidently intended to be impressive. He confesses that his sources of information were incomplete and not entirely reliable. It would have been better to wait until he had made himself master of his material.

The story of the estrangement between the Church and the stage is even more sad than the story of the apostasy of literature because the connection between the two is closer since modern drama owes its existence to the Church to whom it was in the beginning a faithful child and a loyal handmaid. There were faults, no doubt, on both sides as usually happens in quarrels between a too-strict parent and a too-headstrong child. The drama was enticed away from its allegiance by Humanism, debauched by the new religion, and reviled and given a bad name by Puritans. And the Church was, perhaps, too ready to believe the worst of her erring child and acted towards it more like the stern unforgiving parent than a *pia mater*. Is this a too fanciful personification of the relations between the Church and the stage? We think of modern play-writing and play-acting as essentially secular pursuits, forgetting that they had their origin in the church—nay, in the sanctuary itself, so far as our English drama is concerned. English plays have this characteristic as compared with Continental plays that they are less didactic in form and more objective, relying on the story of the play to convey the message of the dramatist by means of the action. This was the method of our Lord's teaching in the parables, so it is not difficult to see whence they got their technique. One secret of George Bernard Shaw's success as a playwright is that he broke away from this tradition and gave us something new; he does not tell a story; he stages a debate between people in fancy dress. In *The Apple Cart*, for instance, King Magnus holds a long debate with Boanerges on aristocracy versus Communism; there is no action, but the King wears a sort of officer's "undress blue" and the Minister is clad in a red blouse, leathern girdle, wide trousers and Russian boots—no action is needed, the boots are almost enough without the blouse. Similarly in *St. Joan*, Shaw gives us his idea of the origins and meaning of Protestantism; it is modern

Shavian philosophy, pure imagination; but we get an impression of historical reality because we are looking at one actor dressed as a mediæval bishop and another dressed as a feudal baron. The dramatist's genius does the rest.

But all drama, Shavian or other (I am not talking, of course, of shows for the tired business man), has the same end in view, to instruct the understanding and influence the will. The Church, I need not add, has identical aims. It is a thousand pities, therefore, that the Church has been denied, or has denied herself, such a powerful aid to her mission. Happily, there are signs that the estrangement is coming to an end. Reconciliation is being hastened by the fact that educationists have discovered the pedagogical importance of plays. The drama is going to school again and it is a good sign that Catholic schools are welcoming it. When the history of this movement comes to be written it will be found that one of its notable sponsors is Father F. H. Drinkwater, whose collection of religious plays, entitled *Gabriel's Ave*,⁵ lies before me.

There was a time and that not so very long ago when it was a very powerful recommendation to say of a book that it marked a new way of writing the life of a saint. Tired of the old conventional hagiographers people eagerly devoured books in the new style. But the spell has ceased to work; there are so many good lives of saints now that the curiosity motive is not sufficient. I am not going to say, therefore, that Mrs. Margaret Yeo in *The Greatest of the Borgias*⁶ has discovered a new way of writing a saint's life. In one sense it would not be true. Mrs. Yeo has merely written the life of St. Francis Borgia in her own way, the way in which she wrote the life of Don John of Austria, and for most readers that will be a sufficient recommendation. There is the same depth of feeling and wealth of colour, there is the same power of producing a balanced narrative which among painters is called the faculty of composition, the conscious grouping of figures in relation to each other so that each shall produce its maximum effect. After the drab monotone affected by many present-day writers, the harmonic vivacity of Mrs. Yeo's prose is at first calculated to make the reader doubtful. But there is no cause to fear; her touch is sure and she never falters.

The two collaborators who write under the names of Euphan and Klaxon have already made a reputation by their delightful stories incorporating local history for the young. Their latest book, *The Touchstone*,⁷ is a series of pleasant fireside talks on events that happened round a hearthstone that had had a long history before it came to rest in its present dwelling place, an old Berkshire manor house.

⁵ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 5s.

⁶ Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.

⁷ Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

EPISCOPAL RING.

Are there in existence any rules regulating the practice of genuflecting on the part of the faithful when they kiss a bishop's ring? (A.)

REPLY.

The custom of kissing the ring of a bishop has developed from the more ancient custom of kissing the hand of a priest in salutation—a natural sign of reverence since it is anointed at ordination, it handles the Sacred Species and distributes sacraments and divine blessings. In England, except when directed by liturgical rules and in the case of newly-ordained priests, the custom has died out, but it continues in many Catholic countries.

In the case of bishops and other prelates who wear a ring, it is natural enough to kiss the ring instead of the hand. The episcopal ring is blessed at his consecration and signifies, in rather the same way as the marriage ring, that the bishop is bound or wedded to his diocese. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* still directs throughout that the hand of the bishop should be kissed and only refers to kissing the ring at the moment it is placed upon his hand by the assistant priest: “annulo prius et manu postea deosculatis.”¹ The practice of kissing the ring always instead of the hand now appears to be universal and has been sanctioned by S.R.C. The genuflection appropriate to this sign of reverence, during liturgical functions, offers no difficulty and is governed by rubrical and ceremonial directions.

It is the extra-liturgical use that our correspondent has chiefly in mind. Pius X, March 18th, 1909, granted an Indulgence of fifty days to anyone kissing the ring of a bishop or of a Cardinal, and there is no restriction to liturgical occasions. It is, therefore, the wish of the Church that the practice should be encouraged.

The genuflection which usually accompanies it is an action which is really quite distinct from the sign of reverence implied in kissing the hand or the ring, and it is not, of course, required for gaining the Indulgence. It is a recognition of the jurisdiction of the Bishop or other prelate. Inasmuch as the whole question of this action, when performed extra-liturgically, is a matter of custom and etiquette rather than of law, it is not easy to formulate rules about it. Apart from local custom, it is more correct to kiss a bishop's ring without genuflecting

¹ Lib. II, c. viii, n. 22.

when it is done by those who are not his subjects, for example, when a bishop is outside of his own diocese, particularly when the diocesan bishop is present. It is usual to genuflect when kissing the ring of Cardinals, because of their eminent dignity, but in Rome it is not usual out of respect for the person of the Pope. Similarly, this sign of submission should be paid to an archbishop throughout his province and to a bishop within his diocese, unless the prelate himself does not desire it. Quite commonly the bishops in France, with an appropriate gesture, show that a genuflection is not required. On the same principle, in this country, a diocesan bishop does not expect certain senior clergy to genuflect. Inasmuch as it is a question of showing courtesy by doing what is usual, it is better to err on the right side, by showing too much respect rather than too little. It is the custom, in England, for the laity to genuflect when kissing the ring of all bishops and without regard to their possessing jurisdiction or not. It would, we think, be more correct if the distinction were observed, but the matter is not of sufficient importance to call for any change in established usage.

E. J. M.

PERSONAL EXPENDITURE OF RELIGIOUS.

A religious in simple vows while on holidays buys a sweep-stake ticket without permission on the part of his superior, using money given for another purpose. He wins and gives the winnings to his parents. What are his obligations in conscience?

What would be his obligations if he were in solemn vows?

What if he gave the ticket to his parents before the draw?
(F. R.)

REPLY.

A religious takes holidays for the same purpose as other folk—to avoid staleness and the risk of breaking down, to regain freshness and fitness. The essence of the holiday is that his hourly doings are now chosen by himself instead of being appointed by rules and superiors.

Money is given him to enable him to make a real holiday—not to cramp him in doing what holiday-makers do. A gift of a ten shilling ticket to his parents is natural and reasonable.

In some Congregations the holiday explicitly includes permission “to give and receive.”

A religious doing parish work, who thought his health needed golf all through the year, was told by his Superior that he ought to have paid the *year's* subscription out of his *holiday* money.

In the case before us the ten shilling ticket won a prize in the sweep, and he gave the prize money to his parents. And we are told that the ten shillings was given him for “another purpose.”

(1) If the ten shillings was part of his holiday money, he need not scruple to spend it for the benefit of his parents. But if it

was given for some other definite purpose, he is bound to tell his superior how he used the money.

(2) If the custom of his Congregation is to give an account of how the holiday money has been used, he must, of course give that account.

(3) "Quidquid acquirit monachus acquirit monasterio suo." And clearly the holiday permission does not contemplate disposing of sums like a sweep-prize. It can be reasonably argued that this sum belonged to the community as soon as it was won; and he had no right to dispose of it. But also it can be reasonably argued that, as far as concerned the community, he was only disposing of ten shillings of his holiday money. If his conscience cannot rest in this second alternative, then once more his only course is to put the facts before his superior.

(4) If he gave away the ticket *before* the draw, he never owned the winnings and no problem can arise about them.

(5) I do not see that simple or solemn vows make any difference.

J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B.

JUVENILES AND CENSURES.

Comparing Canon 88, §2, with Canon 2230 it appears that girls may incur censures from the age of twelve, but boys from the age of fourteen. Since the question is of some practical importance in the *external forum*, whenever it is a question of juvenile converts being absolved from the censure of heresy, could you say whether this difference of age, as between boys and girls, is to be taken into account? In the case of twins, aged thirteen, would it be necessary to absolve the girl from censure but not the boy? (B.)

REPLY.

From Canon 2230 we find that "impuberes" are excused from incurring censures *latae sententiae*: "Impuberes excusantur a poenis latae sententiae, et potius poenis educativis, quam censuris aliisve poenis gravioribus vindicativis corrigantur. . . ." The age of puberty is determined by Canon 88, §2, "Minor, si masculus, censetur pubes a decimoquarto, si femina, a duodecimo anno completo." Hence the query set out above.

A number of canonists draw the rigid conclusion, from comparing these canons, and require the difference of age to be taken into account in determining whether a censure has been incurred or not. Others, such as Vermeersch and Prümmer, take a more liberal line and favour the age of fourteen for both sexes. Undeniably the more rigid conclusion is a logical deduction from a comparison between Canon 2230 and Canon 88, §2. But a rule which governs all censures is that a liberal interpretation is to be followed where possible: "In poenis benignior est interpre-

tatio facienda."¹ In our opinion it is right to follow the more liberal view here, both because of the authority of the authors who adopt it and because of the intrinsic reason underlying their view, namely, that the earlier age of puberty in a girl does not mean that she enjoys greater deliberation and responsibility. The most recent manual that we have consulted, Tummolo-Iorio, itself a recension of the famous Gury, teaches this view: "Ad effectus legis poenalis, feminae, quoad pubertatem, aequiparantur, saltem probabiliter, maribus, ita ut pro utrisque attendenda sit aetas 14 ann. expletorum."² We recorded this interpretation in an article on reserved censures in this journal, Vol. III, p. 42, and replied to the criticism of a distinguished correspondent *ibid.*, p. 437.

E. J. M.

VIATICUM BEFORE OPERATIONS.

Further to the information given on page 156 of the August issue, a more explicit solution would be welcome. Could it not be said that, generally speaking, the danger which justifies a serious operation justifies Extreme Unction, in which case the patient should be anointed and receive Holy Communion by way of viaticum? (X.)

REPLY.

With regard to Extreme Unction it is necessary to examine the patient's condition at the moment of its reception. Usually, if a serious operation is pending, the patient is seriously ill and should be anointed. If a person is sufficiently ill to be anointed it follows that Holy Communion may also be administered non-fasting *per modum viatici*.

But it might quite easily happen that there is no danger of death at the moment from the patient's condition, and that a serious operation is being voluntarily accepted in order to prevent some permanent disability. After the operation the patient might well be in sufficient danger to receive the last sacraments, but before the operation he is, relatively speaking, in good health. In this case Extreme Unction cannot validly be received. May he receive Holy Communion non-fasting *per modum viatici* owing to the danger of the impending operation? The solution of the doubt depends entirely on forming the judgment that the operation is a serious one from which death may, perhaps, result. If an affirmative judgment can be given it follows that Holy Communion may be received non-fasting. Dr. V. Coucke, writing in *Collationes Brugenses*, 1934, p. 383, admirably expresses the point at issue: "Non debet jejunium servare; (a) Propter *periculum mortis*, qui Viaticum recipit, etiam ex devotione tantum et, quod advertere velis, etiam si hac occasione extremam unctionem non recipit, aut recipere nondum

¹ Canon 2219, §1.

² Edition 1936. Vol. II, n.909, note (1) and n.582, p. 27.

potest. Non jejunus communicare quis potest, sive periculum mortis ab intrinseco proveniat (ratione morbi) et quidem quousque illud periculum manet, sive ab extrinseco oriatur, dummodo probabile sit *ultimam* sumi communionem, puta propter proelium instans, aut urgentem operationem chirurgicam periculosam, aut propter instantem executionem capitalem."

There will always be a margin of doubt concerning the impending danger of death, and it is to be resolved in favour of the patient, according to the teaching of all the writers: "Periculum mortis incipit, ubi gravis ratio adest, infirmum moriturum esse; non sufficit mera possibilitas, quae semper adest, sed nec requiritur moralis certitudo. Quamdiu hoc periculum durat, manet exemptus. Si dubium est, utrum infirmus sit in probabili mortis periculo, utrum morbus revera letalis sit necne, viaticum nihilominus administrare potest non jejunus, tum quia obligatio jejunii non constat, tum quia recte praesumitur ecclesiam in hoc casu favere aegrotis, ne exponatur periculo decedendi sine viatico."¹ The solution is clear enough in cases of danger *ab intrinseco* and the same applies to danger *ab extrinseco*. The chief difference between the two is that, in the latter case, viaticum is permitted only on the last occasion of receiving Holy Communion immediately preceding the danger, as the writer in *Collationes Brugenses* notes.

E. J. M.

VIATICUM REPEATED THE SAME DAY.

In Catholic hospitals where the patients communicate each morning it sometimes happens that, in the course of the day, one of them is put on the "danger" list. Is reception of Holy Communion obligatory a second time, in such cases? (B.R.)

REPLY.

Canon 864: "§1. In periculo mortis, quavis ex causa procedat, fideles sacrae communionis recipiendae praecepto tenentur. §2. Etiam si eadem die sacra communione fuerint refecti, valde tamen suadendum, ut in vitae discrimen adducti denuo communicent." That there is no *obligation* of receiving Holy Communion again as viaticum is clear from this canon, although previous to the Code many followed St. Alphonsus¹ in teaching that there was an obligation at least in those cases where the danger of death arose *ab extrinseco*. The precept of receiving viaticum is fulfilled by the previous communion, even though the person was not conscious of any danger. The force of the words "valde suadendum" cannot, therefore, refer to persuading the person to fulfil this precept again; their meaning must refer to something other than the fulfilment of a precept. The situation is that the person who has already

¹ Noldin, III, §153.

¹ *Theol. Moral.*, VI, n. 285.

communicated is made aware, in the course of the day, that he is dangerously ill, and in this condition the grace and solace of the sacrament would be of great assistance in preparing for the possibility of death. It is right that he should be persuaded to neglect nothing that the Church can offer. It might be said that the danger existed at the time of the first reception of Holy Communion, in the morning, and that it was, as a matter of fact, viaticum which should not be repeated on the same day. But the person was not conscious of the danger at that time and, although the precept is fulfilled, a second reception is to be advised. E. J. M.

POSITION OF THE TABERNACLE.

Occasionally, in parish churches, the Blessed Sacrament is reserved at some altar other than the high altar of the church. Is this practice considered more liturgically correct? (L.A.)

REPLY.

Canon 1268: " §2. Custodiatur in praecellentissimo ac nobilissimo ecclesiae loco ac proinde regulariter in altari maiore, nisi aliud venerationi et cultui tanti sacramenti commodius et decentius videatur, servato praescripto legum liturgicarum quod ad ultimos dies hebdomadae sanctae attinet.

" §3. Sed in ecclesiis cathedralibus, collegiatis aut conventualibus in quibus ad altare maius chorales functiones persolvendae sunt, ne ecclesiasticis officiis impedimentum afferatur, opportunitum est ut sanctissima Eucharistia regulariter non custodiatur in altari maiore, sed in alio sacello seu altari.

" §4. Curent ecclesiarum rectores ut altare in quo sanctissimum Sacramentum asservatur sit prae omnibus aliis ornatum, ita ut suo ipso apparatu magis moveat fidelium pietatem ac devotionem."

The Canon repeats previous decisions of the Congregation of Rites. The high altar is the normal place in a parish church, unless exceptionally some other altar is more suitable and fitting. This might happen on occasion, and for the same reason that makes reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in a side chapel "opportune" in a cathedral or collegiate church, namely, the occurrence of a function, such as Confirmation, which is inconsistent with the reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament. In a cathedral, the occasions when the bishop is seated with his back to the high altar, or when complicated rites are being performed, are so frequent that the Blessed Sacrament is habitually reserved elsewhere. Similar reasons may, of course, be present habitually in a parish church, but it is rather difficult to imagine this happening. It is sometimes said, in defence of the practice, that the tabernacle at a side altar is more securely constructed; this is not a good reason for breaking the law, since it should be possible to remedy the defect in the tabernacle at the high altar. On the other hand, a sufficient

cause would exist if, for some special reason, the high altar is less beautiful and ornate than an altar in a side chapel. This could happen in an unfinished church which has a fine lady chapel but a temporary chancel and high altar of mean appearance. Another good reason would exist in the case of a parish church the chancel of which attracts numbers of curious sightseers causing disturbance and distraction. It is quite certain that a well-meant desire to be more "liturgical" is an example of misplaced zeal, having regard to the law of Canon 1268, which requires "regulariter" that the Blessed Sacrament should be reserved at the high altar.

E. J. M.

PETITIONS ON THE ALTAR.

Saying Mass in a convent chapel the celebrant frequently finds a heap of envelopes containing petitions placed on the altar. He disapproves of this practice and would be glad of some official text supporting his attitude. (M.J.)

REPLY.

This is a devotional practice which rests on no very solid foundation, as far as can be discovered. The only official text which can be quoted against it is to be found in the rubric of the Missal which forbids anything whatever to be placed on the altar except what is necessary for the sacrifice of the Mass and the adornment of the altar. "Super altare nihil omnino ponatur, quod ad Missae sacrificium vel ipsius Altaris ornatum non pertineat."¹ These petitions should not be on the altar even during the time when Mass is not being celebrated. It is equally wrong, of course, and a further example of misplaced zeal, for the envelopes to be slipped between the altar cloths.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

Pioneers of the Faith. By Lieut. Col. F. J. Bowen. (Ouseley. 5s.)

This book is confessedly an appeal for the missionary zeal and activity so constantly urged upon us all by the present Holy Father. It is an entrancing narrative of outstanding persons and events in the history of missionary enterprise which is calculated to fire the imagination and rouse the zeal of young and old. In the words of the Archbishop of Westminster's Introduction: "It is a story more thrilling than any romance. But it is fact and not fancy, a real record of heroism and endurance." It is illustrated by sixteen photographs. It can be cordially recommended, and at 5s. it is very cheap.

T. E. F.

¹ *Rubricae Generales Missalis*, n. xx.

The Way of the Cross. By Frank Brangwyn, R.A., with a Commentary by Gilbert Keith Chesterton. (Hodder & Stoughton. 10s. 6d. net.)

A first inspection of Mr. Brangwyn's designs invites comparison with Rubens. There is something of the great master's exuberance in the sure sweeping lines. A closer study reveals spiritual, or mystical, qualities which are nearer to the Primitives. However, to compare Mr. Brangwyn with Rubens is only to say that he belongs to the grand old Flemish tradition, and, as Mr. G. K. Chesterton pointedly remarks, the most original artists are those who come out of a tradition. There is overpowering originality in these designs. The type of Christ is unusual; Mr. Chesterton finds that the sharp features of "the falcon face" are Roman rather than Jewish. All the sufferings of humanity are concentrated in the patient and lonely victim of sin. There is vivid realism, but not of the kind which achieves only the exploitation of horror. The haunting eyes of the sensitive Figure, so sharply defined against the dark background of cruelty and violence, are the eyes of One who looks beyond the events of the passing hour into the soul of every man, and into eternity. The faces of the rabble recall the coarse, brutal types which appear frequently in the later mediæval paintings of Flanders and Germany. Each one is distinctive; in the Third Station, the leering old Pharisee contrasts with the bored and dull-witted executioner. All this turbulent grotesqueness emphasizes the isolation and distinctiveness of the central Figure. In the words of Mr. Chesterton: "There is every shade of passion, or lack of passion, that may go to make up a huge blunder or crime; as if to emphasize the deeper doctrinal conception that every man has his own quarrel with God." Here and there we find a gleam of relief in all this gloom, as in the Eighth Station where, beneath the piercing gaze of the suffering Christ, the homely faces of the women are relaxing to motherly tears, and the little children bow their heads and join their hands in incomprehending sympathy.

As one would expect from such a master as Mr. Brangwyn, from the point of view of artistic composition and technique, these designs are perfect. At the same time, it must be admitted that their strength and individuality are too overwhelming to permit of their being subordinated to the decorative scheme of a public church. They would be more at home in a room apart, or in a private oratory.

J. P. R.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

The September HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW contains an informative article on *American Catholic Versions of the Bible*, by Dr. Steinmüller. At the time of the First Council of Baltimore, in 1829, at least five different types of the Douay-Rheims version were in circulation. The question of a uniform version arose at the Third Council in 1884 but the question was shelved. The various editions, all popularly known as the Douay Version, have never been formally and officially approved by ecclesiastical authority in America as the only authoritative translation. In the same number Fr. C. J. McCarthy pleads for a better recognition amongst Catholics of the dignity and responsibility of the office of *Sponsor at Baptism*. Continuing his commentary on the Code, Fr. Woywood deals with the thorny and difficult subject of *Absolving from Censures*, and explains the force and value of Canon 2254 in absolving from censures outside the danger of death. This Canon is a kind of Magna Charta for the perplexed confessor whenever he has to deal with Censures.

The ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for August contains a translation of the *Holy Father's Encyclical on the Cinema*. In discussing the *Reorientation of Our Seminaries*, Fr. Bonaventure Schwinn asks that dogmatic theology should take more account of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ and should be used far more effectively for the ascetical formation of the students. In Moral Theology he desires to see the subject orientated towards the social, economic and political problems of the day, and he quotes an example of how this is being done at the Catholic University of America, under the guidance of Mgr. John A. Ryan. The author rightly concludes that, when all is said, the really important thing is the "orientation" of the seminarian towards his own personal sanctity, along the lines laid down by Pius X in his exhortation to the clergy of August 4th, 1908. Dr. Schaaf deals at some length with two problems which are as pressing in England as in America: the Catholic burial of public sinners and the attitude all Catholics should have towards those who have fallen away from the Church.

THOUGHT for September opens with a study by Fr. Moran, S.J., on *St. Paul's Doctrine on the Real Presence*, in I Corinthians, Chapter XI. By comparing it with the previous chapter he shows that the sacrificial rite described in Chapter X is the same as the ceremony of the partaking of the real Body and Blood of Christ depicted in Chapter XI. The Eucharist in St. Paul's teaching is a sacrificial rite, instituted by Christ, to be repeated, commemorative of the Passion, and bestowing physical union with the Body and Blood of Christ. Fr. Harney,

S.J., studies the Counter-Reformation in Hungary with an account of the life of *Cardinal Peter Pázmány*, occasioned by the recent celebration in Budapest of the Tercentenary of the Pázmány University. By preaching, writing and founding seminaries for ecclesiastics and colleges for the laity, the Cardinal completed the task of Catholic restoration. He who was born in a Protestant Hungary died in a Catholic Hungary. Dr. Facticeau, in an examination of the *Corneille's Religious Poetry*, shows that in his verse translation of the "Imitation" and "Psalms" are to be found some of the most beautiful lines ever written by a Catholic poet.

An interesting article by Canon Magnin in *LA VIE SPIRITUELLE* for September traces the *Origins of the Parish*. It is all too brief for so vast a subject, but he is able to indicate how the parish arose from a movement of decentralization, by which the primitive Christian communities, which were centred around the bishop and his church, became detached autonomous centres of religious life, whilst retaining always their subordination to the Mother Church.

REVUE D'ASCETIQUE ET DE MYSTIQUE (July-September, 1936) publishes a number of hitherto unprinted letters from *P. Surin to Madame de la Chêze* which illustrate his method of spiritual direction and his characteristic doctrine of perfect dependence on God. We are also given a study of the letter of the General of the Jesuits, P. Claude Aquaviva, on Prayer, in relation to the doctrines of P. Sanchez.

JUS PONTIFICIUM (fasc. i. and ii. of 1936) opens with the oration delivered by the editor, Dr. Toso, on the juristic principles which are at the moment in the ascendancy in Germany. The speech was delivered on the occasion of the visit to Rome of Dr. Frank for the purpose of explaining the ideas of the national socialists. In the same number there is the last instalment of the text of the *Constitution of the Egyptian Church* (Hippolytus). Amongst the practical, as distinct from the theoretical or historical contributions, is a further discussion by Dr. Onclin, *De Rectoribus Seminariorum*, in which the nature of their authority and its extent is explained. Dr. Brems explains the authentic interpretation of the Code to be found in the decisions of the Pontifical Commission.

Fr. Tromp, S.J., in *PERIODICA* (1936, fasc. 3), contributes a detailed analysis of *Catholic Action*, in which he is chiefly concerned with defining as accurately as possible the position of the laity as "co-operators" in the work of the hierarchy. Fr. Lopez continues his demonstration of the theory of *Probabilism* from St. Thomas, and has occasion to refer to the famous decree of Innocent XI, concerning Fr. Thyrsus Gonzalez, in its authentic and apocryphal forms. This excellent Review is giving increased space to liturgical questions of a practical kind.

LES QUESTIONES LITURGQUES ET PAROISSIALES is one of the

oldest liturgical reviews, dating back to 1910, and it is one of the chief organs of what is now known as the "Liturgical Movement." Written for the clergy, it contains excellent historical and practical articles, as well as matter for sermons, which any priest interested in the liturgical life of his parish will find very acceptable. It is a bi-monthly publication, under the direction of the monks of Mont César, Louvain. The current number, 1936, n. 3, has a well-conceived article by Dr. Capelle which brings together all the recent pronouncements of the Holy See on the restoration of liturgical worship.

FROM THE HOME REVIEWS.

THE MONTH (September): Mercy Murder by A. Guthrie Badenock; The Early Mind of Anglicanism by B. C. McKenzie; The Church in Finland by Marita Emeleus; St. Teresa and the Dominicans by Archbishop Goodier.

BLACKFRIARS (September): Dominican Spirituality by Gervase Mathew, O.P.; The Sixth Malines Congress by C. van Gestel, O.P.; The Church of England and Transubstantiation by Vincent McNabb, O.P.; The Origins of the Anglican Ministry by M. J. Congar, O.P.; Catholicism in England by Thomas Gilby, O.P.

STUDIES (September): G. K. Chesterton and Modern England by Hilaire Belloc; Source and Purpose of Political Authority by M. Browne; The Irish in California by George T. Crowley; A Saint of Lyons by Virginia M. Crawford.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

Fr. Aloysius J. Hogan, S.J., writes from Fordham University, New York:—

I am writing in reference to a review of Father Ryan's book on St. Robert Bellarmine, signed by R. Butcher, which appeared on page 426 of your May issue. Mention is made, at the conclusion of the review, of some serious defects in the composition and printing of the volume. In justice to our Fordham University Press, I am writing the following explanation, and I shall be very grateful if you can find it possible to publish the same in some future issue.

This volume was printed by the University of Louvain. Louvain asked us to sponsor the volume, and we gladly consented. No proofs were sent to us, but we felt that we could count on the great University of Louvain to have produced a satisfactory printing job. It seems, however, that as a result of our generous attitude in the matter, we are the recipients of unmerited criticism.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

one of
urgical
ellent
mons,
parish
under
urrent
apelle
Holy

uthrie
enzie;
ad the

ervase
festel,
incent
M. J.
O.P.
ngland
hority
wley;

. M.

ersity,

book
beared
e con-
osition
rdham
, and
ublish

uvain.
y con-
could
ced a
result
ipients

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XIV. No. 3. The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, SS. Cosmas and Damian

July, 1936.

EDITORIAL.—Annual General Meeting. Fogeyism.

What is Quackery? Medical Missions.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—The Guild and Guild Membership, by Dr. Ray Edridge. A Glance at Modern Psychology (Part II.), by Revd. J. C. Heenan, Ph.D., D.D. Home or Hospital? A Maternity Problem, by a Public Health Official. Sterilization from the Scientific and Moral points of view, by Dr. A. Niedermayer, International Congress of Catholic Doctors at Vienna, Whitsuntide, by Dr. Joan Lamplugh.

ABORTION, STERILIZATION AND DICHOTOMY.

REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTICES.—Father Finney's "Moral Problems," etc., and *The Lancet's* Notice. Dr. Fox on Francis Thompson. *The*

Catholic Herald. The Month. "The French Bulletin."

"The Medical Dictator," by Dr. Major Greenwood.

"Masturbation and the Psycho-Sexual Life," by

Dr. J. F. W. Meagher. "The Coming of the Monster,"

by Owen F. Dudley. "The Repeal of the C.D.

Act." **ACTIVITIES OF OUR MEMBERS.**

NEWS FROM THE BRANCHES.—London, East

Anglia, Brentwood, Nottingham.

CARTOON (by Teg).

NEWS FROM OVERSEAS.—Holland.

OBITUARY.—Dr. Theodore Dillon, Dr. James

Kelland, Dr. M. Leahy, Dr. J. D. McFeely.

Price: 1s. 4d. Annual Subscription, 5s. 0d. (post

free). Subscription for United States \$1.50.

Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,

London; 43, 44, 45, Newgate Street, E.C.1.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES AND
CHARCOAL for use with Incense
OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6227

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON



**chalices
OSBORNE**
117, GOWER ST.
LONDON, W.C.1.
SEND FOR BOOK 16

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 43 Newhall-Hill
Donald B. Tannton Birmingham &
John Hardman Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
& Co. Limited Church Decoration St. Piccadilly,
Private Compy. London, W.

BLACKFRIARS

BLACKFRIARS is a literary and critical monthly, founded by the late Fr. Bede Jarrett, and edited by English Dominicans at Blackfriars, Oxford.

ITS AIM is to provide an organ of authentic Thomist thought, and to appreciate and criticise the various aspects and problems of modern life in the light of Thomist Theology and Philosophy. It is not a domesticated or purely clerical review; it seeks to provide a distinctively Catholic commentary on all manner of current movements and events, to assist Catholics to form their judgment on tendencies of thought and action in the world around them and to enable non-Catholics to understand and share an intelligent Catholic outlook.

CONTRIBUTORS include many well-known Dominicans, both English and foreign, and celebrated Thomist thinkers such as Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, Eric Gill.

THE OCTOBER NUMBER includes PARISH PRIESTS, BEATIFIED AND CANONIZED, by Walter Gumbley, O.P., F.R.Hist.S.; DEFINITION OF PSYCHOLOGY, by Aidan Elrington, O.P.; MASS: THEORY AND PRACTICE, by Conrad Pepler, O.P.; COMMUNIST SELF-CONDEMNATION, by Vincent McNabb, O.P.; PROPERTY, CAPITALIST AND HUMAN, by Eric Gill; PAST AND PRESENT, by André Toledano; PLAIN TALKS ON FUNDAMENTALS, II., by Praedicator.

MONTHLY FEATURES include Editorial, Book Reviews (which PAX has ranked "among the best in any periodical") and "Penguin's" EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS on current periodicals.

BLACKFRIARS may be obtained on ordering from all booksellers, bookstalls, and newsagents, price 1/- a month, or from the Publishers at 1/1½ per copy post free. The annual subscription rate is 12/-.

BLACKFRIARS, 2, Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4.

NEW AND FORTHCOMING BOOKS

THE ROMAN BREVIARY

Translated into English. An English version compiled by the BENEDICTINE NUNS OF STANBROOK. Revised and edited by Charles Francis Brown.

Introduction by Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.

In 4 volumes 15/- each volume.

In Leather at 21/- each volume.

THE CROSS AND THE STAR OF DAVID

By WALTER FRIEDEMANN.

Translated by E. F. PEELER.

In this powerful and moving book Dr. Friedemann tells the story of his conversion to the Catholic Faith from intense hostility against the Church as a prominent worker for Zionism among the Jews in Germany.

Cloth. 7/6

SACKCLOTH AND ASHES

By DOM HUBERT VAN ZELLER, O.S.B.

In this sequel to his PROPHETS AND PRINCES, Dom van Zeller continues his delightfully original and stimulating studies of the Old Testament, with essays on six of the minor prophets.

Cloth. 3/6

THE MYSTIC LIFE OF GRACES

By HIERONYMUS JAEGER.

Translated by REV. W. J. ANDERSON.

The author of this remarkable book, who died in 1919, was a German layman who spent his whole life in active public work. It reveals the nobility and spiritual strength of a thoroughly modern layman who combined the mystic life with an unceasingly industrious life in the world.

Cloth. 7/6

THE JESUITS

By GAETAN BERNOVILLE.

Translated by KATHLEEN BALFE.

Most Catholics will find much that is new to them in Mr. Bernville's lively and informative book. He writes from first-hand investigation of the Jesuit system.

Cloth. 6/-

For Children

Two new additions to the "Series of 'Lives' for Children." Boards 1/- each.

ST. PETER—The First Pope.

By EGERTON CLARKE.

POPE PIUS XI.

By WILKINSON SHERREN.

Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,

43 44 45 Newgate St., E.C.1 and 129 Victoria St., S.W.1

AND AT

MANCHESTER

BIRMINGHAM

GLASGOW

DUBLIN

Printed in Great Britain by Gibbs & Bamforth Ltd., St. Albans, Herts.

